NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

No. DCXLIV.

JULY, 1909.

THE DIRECT PRIMARY.

BY HENRY JONES FORD, PROFESSOR OF POLITICS IN PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

THE master force which impels the direct primary movement now sweeping over the country is desire for popular control of government. Only partisans and reformers would be interested in it if it were offered simply as a means by which a public man, enjoying popular favor, could beat down his party opponents. The idea which commends the direct primary to the masses, and which rallies them to the support of its advocates, is that it is a means of giving power to the people. I purpose in this article to analyze this proposition, which presents the aspect of the case that concerns political science.

Analysis to be useful must be precise. So we must settle at the outset just what is meant by "power" and by the "people." Alexander Hamilton in "The Federalist," No. 33, defined power as "the ability or faculty of doing a thing." The "people" are primarily the collective mass of citizenship, but as a term of American politics it denotes the electorate. So when the direct primary proposition is stated in its exact significance, it means that those who will have the faculty or ability of doing the thing under the conditions in which action shall be taken will be those who will actually determine candidacy for public office. This is the reality contained in the proposal that the selection of party

Copyright, 1909, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY. All Rights Reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

candidates shall be intrusted to the mass of the party electorate. As in all other occupations or activities open to the mass of the people, there will be a differentiation of function among the units of that mass according to aptitude and opportunity. In this respect politics does not differ from art, literature, trade or commerce. They are special differentiations of function in the mass of citizenship.

All this is so elementary that it might seem that, in going into such details, one is explaining the evident and illustrating the obvious. Yet current discussion of this subject is such as to show the necessity of elementary explanation. One continually hears the declaration that the direct primary will take power from the politicians and give it to the people. This is pure nonsense. Politics has been, is and always will be carried on by politicians, just as art is carried on by artists, engineering by engineers, business by business men. All that the direct primary, or any other political reform, can do is to affect the character of the politicians by altering the conditions that govern political activity, thus determining its extent and quality. The direct primary may take advantage and opportunity from one set of politicians and confer them upon another set, but politicians there will always be so long as there is politics. The only thing that is open to control is the sort of politicians we shall have. We can never put the politicians out of business, although we can put the reformers out of business. That fact may seem ironical in view of the opprobrium now resting upon politicians and the credit enjoyed by reformers; but when political conditions are sound, reformers find their occupation gone. President Lowell of Harvard University, in his recent work on "The Government of England," remarks that "England has little that resembles either of the two correlative types of men common in American public life, the spoilsman and the reformer." If the outcry against politicians as a class were just, the reformers as a class would be more censurable, as they create the conditions that breed the spoilsmen. In general, the character of public men is determined by the conditions of their political activity. This principle was perfectly well understood by the Fathers. In the debates in the Convention of 1787, John Francis Mercer of Maryland said: "It is a great mistake to suppose that the paper we are to propose will govern the United States. It is the men

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whom it will bring into the government and interest in maintaining it who are to govern them. The paper will only mark out the mode and the form. Men are the substance and must do the business." Similar expressions abound in "The Federalist," that classic treatise on political philosophy originally produced for the instruction of the people of New York, from whose principles they have deviated only to their injury. It is not the intentions with which measures are proposed, but the conditions they actually introduce, that really count in producing results. This principle was formulated by Alexander Hamilton ("The Federalist," No. 11) as a fundamental law of politics as follows: "Every institution will grow and flourish in proportion to the quantity and extent of the means concentred towards its formation and support." This principle is known as "Hamilton's law of political development." It is universal in its application. If graft flourishes in American politics, it is due to the existence of ample provision for that institution in our political arrangements. Therefore, when any reform is proposed, we should form our judgment of its merits not by the pretences accompanying it, but by scrutiny of the conditions it will establish and by consideration of the sort of men it will tend to bring into power—that is to say, the kind of politicians it will breed.

When the direct primary is thus tested, its true character is revealed. Its pretence of giving power to the people is a mockery. The reality is that it scrambles power among faction chiefs and their bands, while the people are despoiled and oppressed. The fact that the thing is done in the name of the people, and with the pretence that it is done for the people, ought not to obscure the patent facts of the situation. It is clear that if diamonds were handed out one mile up in the air only those having airships could actually be on hand to get them. If they were handed out to first comers at a distant point in the public highway those having automobiles would practically monopolize the gift-taking. If they were regularly handed out to first comers at designated times and places in the city only those having time, means and opportunity of being first in line would actually get them, no matter how emphatically it might be announced that they should be free to all. Precisely the same holds good when offices of valuable emolument and lucrative opportunity are periodically scrambled. The hand-out may be nominally free to all, but in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

practice it goes to those able to obtain positions of advantage, whether by force, fraud, cajolery or favor. The existence of such methods inevitably develops systematic and organized means of controlling the distribution and appropriating its benefits. Hence we have the boss and the machine, as regular institutions of American politics, permanent in their nature, however the personnel of their official staff may change from time to time under stress of competition. We are always pulling down bosses, because transient combinations of would-be bosses and reformers may develop strength enough to overthrow a particular boss or a particular machine. But while bosses and machines come and go, the boss and the machine are always with us. From the standpoint of the public welfare, it is the system that is important and not the individuals who act in it.

The direct primary does not remove any of the conditions that have produced the system, but it intensifies their pressure by making politics still more confused, irresponsible and costly. In its full application it is the most noxious of the reforms by which spoilsmen are generated, for it parallels the long series of regular elections with a corresponding series of elections in every regular party organization. The more elections there are, the larger becomes the class of professional politicians to be supported by the community. Hamilton's law is as constant as any law of physics, and is indeed a corollary of the axioms of physics. The evil consequences are abundantly exemplified by current political phenomena. Many are so subtle and so diffused that it is impossible to catalogue them, but some salient features of the situation may be noted, with specific instances. The following are among the effects of the direct primary:

1. *Graft.*—Nothing is more common than to hear it spoken of as an adventitious blemish upon American politics, whereas it is innate. It is an inevitable outcome of the system; and so long as the system endures, it will flourish in accordance with Hamilton's law. Take the case of the people of New York City, for instance. The law puts upon the community the task of filling the following administrative and judicial positions under the forms of popular election: *State:* Governor, Lieutenant-Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney-General, Engineer and various judicial offices; *County:* Clerk, Sheriff,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Register, District Attorney, Surrogate, Justices; *City:* Mayor, Controller, President of the Board of Aldermen. The New York City budget for 1909 contains an item of $1,035,130 merely for the annual expense of holding these elections, and this is but a small part of the aggregate expense. Every candidate for a nomination must spend money. Campaign work costs heavily. Then on the eve of the election comes "dough day," when the party captain in each district receives money for expenditures in getting out the vote. Altogether the expense runs into many millions of dollars every year.

Now, there is no source of wealth but the industry and resources of the community, and hence, in one way or another, the community must bear the expense of filling the offices. So when the system is such as to entail great expenditures, it falls heavily upon the community. And that is not all. In addition to supplying the funds for electioneering outlay, the community must support a vast staff of professional politicians. This is an infliction under which the people continually groan, but the matter is settled not by their likes or dislikes, but by the conditions, and the conditions are such as to afford vast employment for engineers and stokers in running political machines, the most monstrous and complicated that the world has ever seen. So long as the system is tolerated, its incidents will have to be endured.

In the popular magazines of late there has been much about the superior economy and efficiency of democratic rule in Switzerland, New Zealand and some other countries. Well, there is a reason. And the biggest reason is that their institutions are not subjected to the graft pressure to which American institutions are subject. Not one of the offices mentioned in the foregoing schedule of New York elections is filled by popular election in Canada, England, Switzerland, Australia, New Zealand or in any other country where democratic government is genuine and not counterfeit; nor, indeed, in any other civilized country in the world. Their system of responsible appointment saves the people the many millions of dollars imposed by our system of irresponsible elections, and the advantage thus obtained in the way of public economy is immense.

The direct primary necessarily intensifies graft pressure by multiplying elections. It proposes to parallel regular elections by an antecedent series of party elections to nominate candidates.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The typical effect of the system is accurately set forth in the following extract from a Texas paper, the "Krebs Banner":

"It costs a big pile of money to run for office in the new State of Oklahoma. This is to a very large extent blamed on the primary election system. The results show, it is claimed, that only wealthy men had any chance in the race for Governor or United States Senator. One candidate for Governor is reported to have spent approximately $75,000 and another $50,000 in the primary election campaign. Dr. —— of Enid, and —— —— of Guthrie, men of moderate means, got out of the race because they could not keep the financial pace set by the other candidates. Two or three of the leading candidates in the Senatorial race, it is said, spent from $30,000 to $100,000 in the campaign for the primary nomination. When it is borne in mind that the nominees of the Democratic primaries will have to make another thorough and expensive campaign to win in the 'sure enough' election over the Republicans, it becomes evident that, if the Democrats are to win, it will be at a terrible cost to the leading officers. To win the Governorship will, it is estimated, cost the successful candidate $75,000 more or less, to secure a job paying $4,500 a year, hardly as much as the 'Krebs Banner' makes for its publisher, and much smaller honors. And in the case of the United States Senator, it is but little better than the Governorship, though with vastly superior opportunities for getting ahead of the game by grafting."

There are all sorts of ways "for getting ahead of the game." Public men are frequently subject to attack upon charges of this character. Even the Governor of Oklahoma, a product of the direct primary, has not been exempt. Opinions will differ, of course, as to the merits of any particular case. But it is clear that, when conditions are such that administrative positions can be obtained only by large expenditure, there will be a strong inducement to find ways and means of reimbursement and compensation. The system necessarily means graft, and in all ages graft has been associated with it.

2. *Irresponsibility.*—The whole system of filling administrative and judicial positions under the forms of popular election is a violation of the constitutional principles upon which our government was founded. The fundamental principle of constitutional government is that responsibility shall attach to every act of power. Hence the Fathers attached paramount importance to the principle of executive unity, which provides a definite location of power. The Fathers were in the habit of citing as a maxim of constitutional government that "the executive is most easily confined when it is one." In pursuance of this principle,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Constitution of the United States provides that "the executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America." The power which any Federal attorney, marshal, commissioner, collector, postmaster or other Federal agent exercises is delegated by the President, and may be revoked by the President in his discretion, so that when public opinion acts upon the Presidential office it acts upon the whole administration. Political force flows full and strong in one effective channel. Under the system existing in our States, this force is dissipated among many channels, producing the morass in which we continually flounder in our State politics. Responsibility is too vague, diffused and uncertain to be effectual. Power is not definitely located anywhere. Just such consequences of the violation of the principle of executive unity were predicted by the Fathers. In "The Federalist," No. 63, written either by Hamilton or Madison, it is pointed out that, paradoxical as it may seem, there may be a want of "due responsibility in the government to the people arising from that frequency of elections which in other cases produces this responsibility."

If we turn to private business for an illustration this paradox will become easily intelligible. Suppose the shareholders of a bank should themselves elect its president, its cashier, its secretary, its auditor, its head bookkeeper, its janitor, and in addition a board of directors to pass its by-laws. Suppose that then, in addition, the shareholders in each district of its business field should elect its principal agents likewise as independent authorities. Would any responsibility for business results be left anywhere by this multiplicity of elections? Well, that is the kind of situation which is produced in the public business by the electoral arrangements peculiar to the American State. Responsible government is destroyed.

In this situation, by a prodigy of political talent, a system of party responsibility has been evolved. It is a poor substitute for representative government, for it is unconstitutional in its structure and oligarchic in its authority. It secures its revenues by processes of extortion, justified by custom in consideration of its necessities. Corporations serve as its toll-takers, turning over to it large sums and receiving legislative favor and official protection in return. They act in this capacity willy-nilly, for the conditions are such that they must feed the brute or his teeth

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and claws will be on them. Notice what a ferocious onslaught was made on the railroad corporations all over the country when they cut off the supply of free passes to the politicians under the compulsion of the Federal law! So those charged with large trusteeship, having interests closely intermingled with public interests, find it necessary to spend money for political power and influence. A president of the American Sugar Refining Company, in testifying before a Committee of the United States Senate, blurted out the naked truth about the system. He said: "It is my impression that wherever there is a dominant party, wherever the majority is large, that is the party that gets the contribution, because that is the party which controls the local matters." He explained that such contribution was made because the company had large interests to protect, and he added: "Every individual and corporation and firm, trust, or whatever you call it, does these things and we do them" (Senate Report, No. 606, Fifty-third Congress, second session, pp. 351, 352).

This virtual taxing power, conceded by custom to party organization, rests upon an unconstitutional control which is a product of conditions imposed upon the community by reformers. Those conditions have determined the characteristics and shaped the activities of the politicians. The class interests of the politicians are ordered and graduated in a way that suggests the feudal system and, indeed, is its homologue both in its origin and in its nature. It is a system of personal connection founded on reciprocal duty and service, with its own peculiar code of ethics, stringently enforced. It introduces a principle of responsibility that is gross and imperfect, but is nevertheless genuine. Party organization has a corporate interest that may be reached and acted upon by public opinion, and be held to some responsibility for results. Party government in America is, in fact, a broad-bottomed oligarchy whose administration is costly, negligent and incapable, but which at least sets up barriers against the anarchy and terrorism that always in the past have been the outcome of ochlocratic methods. In Greece, Rome and mediæval Italy the distribution of authority among independent authorities, by means of popular elections, made the state the scene of frequent civil wars. Apart from the United States, the only modern country which tried that system was revolutionary France. The scheme of local government devised by the Constituent Assembly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and promulgated by the decree of December 14th, 1789, was based upon the principles of the direct primary and the recall asserted with logical completeness. All administrative officials were chosen by the citizens meeting in primary assemblies, and these might reassemble to recall and replace obnoxious officials. Special precautions were taken, so far as statute law can go, to make these provisions practically effective. The faction fighting that ensued soon brought about the state of things known in history as The Terror. In the present French Republic, elections are absolutely confined to the choice of representatives. America is the only country that has even been able to maintain tolerable conditions of public order when authority is split up and scattered among factions. This unique achievement stands to the credit of American politicians, and the fact is recognized by philosophical observers. Bagehot in his classic treatise on the English Constitution says that, if Americans "had not a genius for politics, if they had not a moderation in action singularly curious where a superficial speech is so violent, if they had not a regard for laws such as no great people have yet evinced and infinitely surpassing ours—the multiplicity of authorities in the American constitution would long ago have brought it to a bad end."

Our political class is inordinately numerous and inordinately expensive; but the only effectual way of curtailing their number and diminishing the burden of their support is to have less for them to do. Elections should be reduced in number. The direct primary proposes to give the politicians more to do. It provides for a series of elections in advance of the present series. And, at the same time, it strikes down party responsibility by providing that party agents shall no longer hold their posts by efficiency, as now, but by faction favor. The practical effect will be to substitute for existing boss rule a far more corrupt, degraded and impervious sort of boss rule. The change will be analogous to that which took place in the mediæval Italian republics, when local oligarchies were succeeded by professional *condottieri*, heedless of aught save their own gains.

A transformation of this order through the direct primary is noted by the Commission that recently reported a new charter for Boston. The Commission in its report on existing conditions says:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The direct primary system was no doubt intended to abolish partisanship in municipal government, but in its practical working there is no longer the partisanship of a great organization bound theoretically by party principles and having some regard for its political responsibility in the State at large. It is a partisanship of ward organizations, calling themselves Republican or Democratic, as the case may be, but representing no municipal policies capable of formulation. . . . It has made it artificially difficult to secure good nominations; it has debarred the best and most representative citizens from participation in the government; it has increased the power of money in elections; it has practically handed the city over to the ward politicians. It tends to create bad government, no matter how strongly the people may desire good government, and to discredit the capacity of the people when congregated together in great cities to administer their municipal affairs."

That is the characteristic tendency of the direct primary everywhere. If the people do everything themselves, then they have only themselves to blame when things go wrong. In practice, government constituted on such principles means the irresponsible rule of faction. Outrages may be perpetrated for which no party organization would dare to assume responsibility. The case is illustrated by certain facts given by Judge Ben B. Lindsay, of Denver, in a pamphlet entitled "The Rule of Plutocracy in Colorado." On the principle that the people should do everything themselves, the grant of a franchise to a street railway company was submitted to the direct vote of the people. Judge Lindsay charges that the proposition as submitted was shaped in the interest of the railway company, and he says that "no more arrogant and outrageous lawlessness in stealing the property of others was ever enacted." Influential politicians of all parties and public officials were employed by the corporation to carry the proposition at the polls. Judge Lindsay says that the market value of the company's securities was increased $5,000,000 as the result of the election, so that as a business proposition the company stood to win largely even if it took millions to carry the election. Indeed, he estimates that the perpetual franchise the company aimed to secure "would be cheap at $500,000,000." He denounces the behavior of the politicians and public officials who took fees from the company to work in its interest as treachery to the people. But what legal offence did they commit, so long as they did not practise bribery? The responsibility did not rest with them, but with the people. They were employed as advocates—an entirely legitimate occupation. That the trans-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

action was one of public debauchery, as he claims, may be admitted, but the debauchery inheres in the system. The hired advocates did what, on the principle of the direct primary, they had a perfect right to do. Judge Lindsay makes a detailed contrast between the terms obtained under this system and the terms obtained by Toronto in providing street railway service. There the public treasury receives a percentage of the gross income of the railway company, on a rising scale from eight per cent. up to twenty per cent. when the income reaches three million dollars. In addition, the stipulations of the contract require the company to sell tickets at the rate of eight tickets for twenty-five cents during morning and evening hours and twelve for twenty-five cents for school children. Judge Lindsay points to this as an example of what might and should be done, but he fails to draw the moral that to get Toronto results American cities should resort to Toronto means. Well, in Toronto there is no direct primary, no initiative and referendum, and no elections to fill administrative or judicial posts; but there is responsible government. Nothing is further from the truth than to describe the direct primary as a democratic institution. It is the negation of democratic rule, and nothing of the sort is found where democratic government really exists.

Plutocracy.—The rule of bosses and party machines, while a poor substitute for democratic government, is better than any other substitute available in the conditions to which American politics has been subjected. It is at least an integrating force and makes towards responsible government. The bosses correspond to "the undertakers," who are described by Lecky in his "History of England in the Eighteenth Century" as an oligarchy founded upon personal connection and "dexterity in party management." He observes that "this oligarchical connection was unpopular with the people on account of its narrowness and corruption," but he remarks that its overthrow resulted in more corruption than its ascendancy, and he holds that its influence in "binding many isolated and individual interests into a coherent and powerful organization was a real step towards parliamentary government." Since boss rule represents power founded on organized personal connection, it may admit poor men to its sphere and may select poor men for its candidates. Thus it has frequently occurred that poor men of ability have been raised to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

high office by dint of personal ability, and party interest is thus made subservient to public interests. The case of Abraham Lincoln is typical. But when power is conditioned upon ability to finance costly electioneering campaigns, plutocratic rule is established. One of the maxims of the Fathers was that power must exist and be trusted somewhere. Responsible government exactly defines the somewhere, but that crown of representative institutions has yet to be attained in the United States. As the late Speaker Reed frankly declared: "We have at present irresponsible government, so divided that nobody can tell who is to blame." In this situation party organization performs a great service, because it roughly locates power somewhere, thus assuming a vague but real responsibility for the behavior of government. The direct primary impairs this responsibility by making power the football of faction. Power will rest somewhere just the same, but few will know where, so that it will be released from any responsibility for results. The behavior of legislative bodies will be peculiarly exposed to irresponsible influence. It is already plain that the direct primary affords means of setting up secret control. The investigation of the last Senatorial election in Wisconsin showed that various members of the Legislature were employed as electioneering agents. A wealthy candidate, as an incident of his canvass, could get a Legislature deeply under his influence by pecuniary favors. This would be a development quite in accord with historical precedent. The magnate and his clients were a familiar political factor in the government of the Roman commonwealth when it was conducted on the lines that are now imitated in the American state.

Ochlocracy. — Historically, plutocracy and ochlocracy — the money power and the government of the mob—always appear together. It is a favorite theory of reformers that, if there were no organized control, the people would select their wisest and best for public office. This is mere sentimental cant. Favor decides choice when selection is not accompanied by direct and immediate risk of consequences. On May 7th, 1903, Governor Pennypacker vetoed a bill for popular election of mine inspectors. He said:

"Their selection is to be made by the people at an election. The majority of the people, however, have no technical knowledge of mines and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are engaged in other pursuits. The selection would be likely to be made upon other considerations than those of the technical capacity of the miners. They would in all probability be determined by association, by political relations and by all those influences which affect the ordinary voter. To state the proposition is enough in itself to show that this would not be likely to result in securing competent mine inspectors. No one would think of determining the selection of a physician or an engineer to run a railroad train, or the occupant of any other station requiring technical information by a popular vote at an election. In fact the selection of mine inspectors would seem properly to belong to the Executive Department of the government."

In the last New York State campaign, Governor Hughes, on similar grounds, opposed the appointment of members of the Public Service Commission by popular election. He said: "In theory commissioners might be elected, but in practice they would really be appointed by irresponsible men." These sensible comments are just as applicable to any other administrative function.

At the direct primary in Atlanta, Georgia, in June, 1908, the contest for the nomination to the office of coroner was between a blind musician and a one-armed Confederate veteran. The issue seemed to be whether blindness or lameness established the stronger claim to popular favor. The blind man won. In an interview published in the "Atlanta Journal," he explained that he sought the office because he needed the money. "It has always been my ambition," he said, "to go to Munich and complete my studies in music. That, of course, takes money, and the surest and fastest way of making the necessary money, as I see it, is through the coroner's job."

The system, of course, means that if the public business is attended to the people have to support one class of officials to do the work and still another class to attend to the electioneering. Some queer mix-ups occur in the differentiation of these functions. The "Memphis Commercial Appeal," on November 18th, 1908, reports an instructive development. A Grand Jury of Shelby County, Tennessee, complained to the court that no indictments were forthcoming on presentments made. The following facts were disclosed: It had been the practice for a deputy sheriff to frame the indictments. During the campaign the candidate for sheriff was so aggrieved by remarks made by the successful candidate for attorney-general that he would not allow the deputy sheriff to prepare indictments until an acceptable

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

apology was made. The "Commercial Appeal's" account of the affair concludes as follows:

"Sheriff —— said that he was perfectly willing for Mr. —— to write indictments, and that at any time the demand he had made was complied with by Gen. ——, the grand jury work would be restored to its former status.

"Gen. —— says that he and his assistants will write the indictments, and that arrangements will soon be made by which the grand jurors will have all the work they can attend to on each meeting-day. The work is yet new to the attorney-general and both assistants, but they declare that they will master it in a short while."

The sort of influence which the direct primary exerts on the administration of justice is illustrated by this extract from the "Kansas City Times" of August 5th, 1908:

"CARTHAGE, *Missouri, August 4.*—Carthage is at a standstill in the —— murder mystery. Although at least two plausible theories of the affair have been entertained by the authorities, there has not been an arrest yet. The primary elections have diverted the attention of the officers from murder to politics. While the murderer of Dr. —— goes unapprehended, Carthage plays politics. Sheriff —— —— and ——, the constable, who have been working on the case, have suspended operations until after the primaries."

Space will not admit of further details, of which I have a copious supply drawn from actual experience. Mention, however, should not be omitted of one feature of the system, and that is the way in which it oppresses the poor. The recent investigation of social conditions known as "The Pittsburg Survey" directs attention to the large sums obtained by elective justices and constables by petty prosecution. The men who secure these offices are usually chiefs of local political gangs, whose influence is aggrandized by the direct-primary system. Candidates for high office solicit their support and pool interests with them. The poor are helpless against such combinations, and their only chance of tolerable security is to commend themselves to boss protection by political service as in the feudal period. In the sequence of cause and effect there may be at one end the well-meaning reformer and at the other end the poor ground down by a system they can neither comprehend nor withstand. I have yet to find an instance in which the direct primary has actually tended to promote good government, and it is only by some dire confusion of thought that good men can advocate such a pernicious nostrum.

HENRY JONES FORD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE FICTION OF EDEN PHILLPOTTS.

BY W. D. HOWELLS.

In old times before fiction was yet a quick-firing, self-feeding machine-gun, but was a single-barrelled piece which after being deliberately loaded, carefully sighted and skilfully aimed delivered its shot in the very diaphragm of the patiently expectant public, this or that novel might be honestly described as a literary event. Many novels are still so boasted in a variety of terms by the publishers' advertisements, which borrow the inspiration of prophecy and the language of analytic criticism to proclaim the event in anticipation of the fact. Many novels are thus proven even epoch-making events, though the epochs are so brief that the reader has no time to grow gray in them, but is hustled forward to a series of succeeding epochs by other events while still in the flush of his first youth. The effect with the maturer witness is so vertiginous that he hesitates to recognize for himself any recent fiction as an event, far less epoch-making, and one must let so admirable a story as Mr. Eden Phillpotts's last one come and go (the phrase bears me helpless beyond my meaning, for I hope "The Three Brothers" is not soon to go) without attempting to tag it with the familiar and once-valued label. But here I have a question of conscience, somewhat of the difficult and recondite sort which Mr. Phillpotts likes to deal with, or does deal with, whether he likes it or not; and my question is whether I had not better own, at the start, that all this author's books are as new to me as the newest, and are therefore for me, at least, epoch-making, if I prize them as I must say I do. It is open to me either to make this confession, and leave the reader to account for the fact as he may, or to conceal it, and take the chances of its escaping in the course of my proposed comment. I prefer to make the confession not only

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

because it is fairest to the reader who ought to know the man behind the criticism, but also because the truth is on the whole the only safe thing even for a critic.

Let us say, or let us suppose, then, that I have come to Mr. Phillpotts's books, for the first time almost simultaneously with the appearance of his last, and that the fault is as largely mine as the fault ever can be with a reviewer. Let us put aside the pretty problem, which I would like him to solve, of a nature feeling the peculiar charm, the feminine lure of uncandor, but turning in sheer alarm to the repulsive embrace of veracity as its sole refuge. Only a few weeks ago I read so good a short story of Mr. Phillpotts's that I decided to lose no more time in reading everything of his that I could lay hands on. I have since laid hands on nearly everything he has written, and if I have not read everything the blame is not wholly mine. Some of the things done in his process of finding himself and realizing his place in nature and art are not worth considering with the things done since. They need not be named, but may be grouped for censure and dismissal as sins committed while the author was still in the illusion that stories did not grow but were to be made out of romantic adventures and factitious persons. For any Anglo-Saxon author to outgrow this illusion amidst the praises of that criticism which so little represents Anglo-Saxon intelligence is very much; but several authors, of late years, have done it, and prospered on in the face of flattery. I do not think of any more conspicuous instance of survival into the life and light of reality than that of the very vigorous and penetrating imagination which has given us "The Three Brothers," "The Mother of the Man," "The Portreeve," "The Virgin in Judgment," "The Children of the Mist," "The Whirlwind," "The Secret Woman." These all have to do with nature and human nature as the author has known them in the region of Devonshire which he has made his own as Thomas Hardy has made Wessex his. There are other books of Mr. Phillpotts's which deal in the same air with the same sort of character, but with varying degrees of inferiority. They are not masterly, to say the least, and the ones I have named are masterly, though they are not equally masterpieces. I should like the reader to join me in judging him by them, for I believe that an author should be judged by his best. His less than best is, in a manner,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not done; or if this will not hold, then his less than best is not to be taken into account, unless in future work he recurs to the make of it.

In my acquaintance with the first of his masterpieces my opinion of our author came with an ease that ought to have made me suspicious, for nothing that comes easy is quite right. I said to myself, "He is a minor Thomas Hardy," and this though right was not quite right. He is a minor Thomas Hardy, but much more. He has a like joy in the face and heart of the earth, and he gets very close to the secret that remains hers, however we try to surprise it. But somehow the last mystical meaning of our great mother is withheld from him, that indicible charm which Hardy imparts to us almost as wordlessly as it was imparted him. Mr. Phillpotts gives us noble landscapes, honest, faithful, impressive, which he clearly does from loving to do them and which are as far as could be from what a simpler age than this used to prize as "word-painting." His stories abound in them; each book begins with one, and nearly every chapter, but they do not take the eye or hold the memory like those counterfeit presentments of people in which he excels. What of effort is evident in his work is the effort to relate his action to his scene, but his people would be as fully alive anywhere else as they are in Devonshire. He makes them so true that you have only to go to your own knowledge of yourself and of others for the proof of them. Nobody is quite like him in his skill of realizing them, but he is not the artist he is by any miracle. He has grown an artist from the clever artisan of his earlier books, which concern the things that happen to a man rather than the things which happen from him, and constitute his vitality. Even in his later books, which concern life, that is to say conduct, and not fortune, the novelist is still so far in his tradition as over-plentifully to supply his characters with adventure, and more things happen to them than happen from them, or than their conduct necessarily implies. When such things happen they form for me a serious break in the interest, but I am aware of a large prehistoric public which requires of a novelist that he shall keep things happening, whether or no, and I must not expect to have matters all my own way. While I am thus hinting faults, and hesitating dislikes, I will say that there seems rather more talk in the books than is needed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the transaction of their business, or the revelation of character, or even the expression of opinion or emotion. Sometimes the over-much talk is Mr. Phillpotts's own, and that is worse; but at the same time I am bound to say that it is very good talk, and whether his or the others' is very natural and very distinctive; his persons talk in character, though they overtalk. At my time of life, also, I find over-much love-making hard to bear, though it may be very good love-making, as it nearly always is in Mr. Phillpotts's stories. Still, I acknowledge that the world abounds in younger readers who may not yet have had their fill of it, and who have their right to be appeased, to be glutted; a novelist cannot always be writing for readers over seventy.

The faults I have hinted prevail less in the masterpieces mentioned than in such prentice work as "The Dagger Farm," "The American Prisoner," "The Sons of the Morning," "The Good Red Earth." I leave out of the account altogether such jobs as "The Golden Fetich" and "Doubloons." When a novel is well imagined in truth and righteousness things are apt to be better in it of themselves than could have been forecast; they work together for excellence, and relieve the author of much labor. His toil lies in the stories which he makes up because he thinks stories can be made up out of adventures, or traditions, and may hide their inherent weakness in strange lands or other days. Mr. Phillpotts has served his time to this error, but for the most part he is now actual and immediate.

One picturesque region in Devonshire is always his scene, and its inhabitants, of slightly varying levels, afford full sweep for the play of his imagination. It is as if Mr. Thomas Hardy had found Egdon Heath the satisfying scene of all his actions; but Dartmoor is a larger theatre apparently, and more densely peopled with men and women not quite so simple as Mr. Hardy's, but of natures as primitive and passions as wayward and wilful. We miss the play of Hardy's humorous sense of his folk, though now and then Mr. Phillpotts lets us see how quaintly droll some of his own can be. I tremble at this point to say that he seems often to go deeper in motive than his predecessor, and that he betters his instruction in finding nobler types of women. I hate to own that any one can be better than Mr. Hardy in the same air, and besides I doubt if anything is to be accomplished by this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sort of comparison. But to keep to the safe positive ground, we may recognize that he penetrates recesses of the heart not hitherto explored, and deals with fresh surface facts of life in a way he seems to have found out for himself. He seems to take a hint from the openness of his people, and to show them as often as they are so, unbelievers, agnostics, doubters, deniers, very atheists. They are less cruelly bound in the gyves of conscience than George Eliot's folks, of whom they remind you almost as much as of Mr. Hardy's; they are allowed more joy in "the freedom of the broken law"; but their destiny, if not their conduct, is held in as strict allegiance to the law. Their manners and customs are frankly and inlaboriously noted; we are harassed with as little dialect as need be; and are made to see how the thought of the age has penetrated Dartmouth as effectively as London, without more changing character. The same enmities and amities are at work, and science as boldly questions religion among the rustics whose outward lives still conform to ancient tradition. Mr. Phillpotts's more violent people have frequent occasion to curse and to swear, and then he lets them take the name of God in vain without the employment of the typographical devices in which printed profanity used to soften itself. The irreligious do not go either to church or to chapel; the infidels fearlessly question the existence of God and the goodness of God, and deny the benevolence of nature. There is apparently a great deal of pessimism in Dartmouth, but this does not prevent the observer of its life from divining a heart of sweetness in it as diffused but as positive as the honey of its furze and heather. The farm and its interests are strongly realized, but we are made to see how the insidious and incessant spirit of change has pierced to the core of things there as elsewhere. The paganism which we are sometimes aware of in Mr. Hardy's rustics is sensible in Mr. Phillpotts's, but the atheism of his moor men is as far from polytheism as from monotheism; they have scarcely more superstition than religion.

It is their passions, their propensities, their wills, their natures which remain primitive, and often as volcanic as the fires which fused the rock of their pasture in perdurable granite. Whether they believe or disbelieve, whether they deny God throughout the universe, or know Him in every thought and motion of their being, these things in them continue the same, characterized of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

course by conditions, and somewhat shaped by circumstances, but essentially of the pristine quality. It is perhaps because the elemental forces have freest play in "The Whirlwind" that I am, in spite of a final doubt of its right to such primacy, inclined to put it first among Mr. Phillpotts's books. It has not the range and the tolerant wisdom of "The Three Brothers," and it has not the spiritual beauty and the affectional force recognized in "The Mother of the Man," but for solid and massive tragedy it stands alone among the author's books. The traits and incidents which play about the central motive and follow to the supreme event are as graffites on the surface of that monolith. In the *aer cieco* their fate is so terrible, the woman's treason is so strange and the man's revenge so resolute that an inevitable doubt tempers the effect. If it is possible that a woman should still love her husband while she yields rather in compassion than in passion to another's love of her, the case is too abhorrent for acceptance, though the skill of the author is such that while you deny it in fiction you feel that it may have happened in life. It is all of the mystic quality of Anna Karenina's dream, in which her husband and her lover are reconciled in their common possession. It is as far outside of moral question as that is, and the author does well in leaving it to the doom that overtakes it when, the paramour being already dead, the wife saves her husband from murder by killing herself. This also saves the author much trouble, and spoils the critic's case against him. But the question remains whether such a woman as we are shown would have been such a woman as she becomes; though there is no doubt that her husband would have become such a man as he does. His part is indeed simpler: as a rigid fanatic with no allegiance to anything but the God momently revealed to him in his innate faith and constant worship. Of course it is the God of his own making, a God of truth and purity and justice, but without the mercy which comes to the creature in the supreme moment from his own human nature. The thing is masterfully well done. For the time you are compelled to believe that the compassionate woman's mind has been corrupted and her intelligence darkened without taint to her soul; but afterwards you find this more than ought to have been asked of you.

Perhaps the author does not quite ask it; perhaps he recog-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nizes a tragedy beyond the explicit or implicit tragedy. After all, nothing is so mystical as every-day life, that is to say, conduct; and such greatness as this author convinces us he has lies in his sense of the mystical quality of conduct, of every-day life. He evinces this in those other great novels of his: in "The Children of the Mist," in "The Portreeve," in "The Mother of the Man," in "The Virgin in Judgment," in "The Secret Woman," in "The Three Brothers." I do not know that the last named, which is the last written, is an advance upon the rest in power, but perhaps it is in art, for either I feel in it, or I imagine in it, the repose which is the ultimate expression of art. I ought not to disadvantage the others by comparisons which may not hold under careful scrutiny, but to the casual glance may seem just. I prefer to look at each book in the positive way, and to praise the last as a faithful and convincing portrait of three natures, allied in their difference and changing places not only through the accidents of experience, but by the emergence of forces inherent in each. The most interesting is that of the falsely benevolent brother whose perpetual will to be helpful and kind brings ruin on himself and his beneficiaries. The pessimistic brother, who takes up his failure and repairs it, is a triumph of characterization in which the author keeps himself from sentimental excess by good fortune little short of miraculous. He does not quite ask too much of us, but he almost does so; and he does not help himself out by tragical chance as in "The Portreeve," where the ruling passion, the inverted love which has become hate, fulfils itself blindly and involuntarily. "The Mother of the Man," in which the maternal instinct rises to inspiration, and "The Virgin in Judgment" in which the celibate instinct works horror and despair are not so surpassingly good art as "The Secret Woman," or "The Children of the Mist," the heart of whose mystery is harder to pluck out. Not that I fancy myself plucking out the heart of any of those mysteries in having so barely stated its dynamic motive. The mystery of art as of life is in the static things; to these we go back and rest and refresh ourselves in them after the moving forces have swept us helpless to the end. It is in the abundance of these static things that the lasting charm of this new great novelist exists. I do not claim him the cause or effect of anything epochal. He arrived in his order, not because George

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Eliot and Thomas Hardy were before him, but because the revelation of the moral government of the universe perpetually demands prophecy, and when one voice is exhausted finds another. There are notes and inflections and tones in the later voice that remind us of the earlier; but that does not matter; what really matters is that it utters the truth in the forms which, whether we have ever known them in life or not, we know to be real.

W. D. HOWELLS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BRITISH FARMERS AND THE FISCAL QUESTION.

BY WILLIAM E. BEAR.

To American farmers, who cannot see the arrival in their country of a few cargoes of potatoes in seasons of scarcity, without making an outcry against "competition with European pauper labor," although they are protected by a duty of twenty-five cents per bushel of sixty pounds, or 38*s.* 10*d.*, per English ton, it must seem strange that their fellow farmers in Great Britain submit quietly to the unrestricted competition of the whole world. As a matter of fact, there is no "pauper labor" in Scotland, whence the supply of potatoes when the crop is short in the United States is occasionally obtained, and it may even be questioned whether the average income of a farm laborer and his family throughout Great Britain is not greater than that of half the farmers of North and South America. On the other hand, British farmers are called upon to meet the competition of millions of half-starved growers of farm produce in Europe, of vast multitudes of Indian ryots who live on about six cents per day, and of occupiers of land obtained for nothing or at very low prices and almost free from taxation in North and South America and Australasia. Yet, while generally recognizing the fact that the agriculture of the United Kingdom has been half ruined by foreign and colonial competition, the farmers are not by any means unanimous in their desire for a change in the fiscal policy of the country. So far as England alone is concerned, there is abundant evidence to show that the great majority of farmers would welcome such a change; but not a few, even in that division of the kingdom, are distinctly adverse to it, while others are indifferent concerning it. That this division of opinion would not exist to an important extent if there were

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

any prospect of substantial duties on farm products is more than probable; but there is a common conviction that the nation will never agree to taxes on imported food sufficiently high to compensate certain sections of agriculturalists for the disadvantage of duties on commodities that they purchase, and this renders some farmers antagonistic to the disturbance of the existing system, and others doubtful as to its desirability.

By driving grain crops to a great extent out of cultivation, one-sided Free Trade has diverted agricultural enterprise largely into other branches of production, and particularly into the supply of milk to the cities and towns, at present the mainstay of a large proportion of British farmers. Now, there is no foreign competition worth mentioning in the supply of fresh milk; numerous attempts to convey it from the Continent of Europe to British markets having failed to prove remunerative. Therefore, milk-sellers would have nothing to compensate them for any advance in the prices of feeding-stuffs brought about by duties on grain. It is true that such a trifling duty as has been suggested on other kinds of grain than maize would not materially raise prices, while the proposed extra duty on flour would encourage home milling, and thus render grain offals more plentiful than they are at present. But any advances on the kinds of grain taxed would affect the prices of all feeding-stuffs to some extent, and men who do not sell grain, but buy it and other feeding-materials, are apprehensive of an immediate disadvantage from small duties in the first instance, and of possible increases hereafter.

Other farmers who formerly grew grain crops largely, or who have succeeded former growers, direct their enterprise mainly to the breeding or feeding of live stock, and many of them either produce no grain at all, or grow less than they consume, so that they are adverse to the taxing of it. Producers of butter and cheese in many cases are also buyers rather than sellers of grain, and some of these men likewise are disposed to fear that a change in our fiscal system might be disadvantageous to them. Those of them who are of a different opinion hope that sufficient duties on imported live stock, meat and dairy produce to overbalance any increases in the prices of feeding-stuffs may some day be imposed.

That the changes in the farming of land in the United King-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dom rendered necessary by Free Trade have been impoverishing in a very high degree there is no doubt whatever. Since 1875, shortly before agricultural depression became severe, over four million acres of arable land, or more than one-twelfth of the total area in crops and grass, have been converted into permanent pasture. Such a conversion could have been made advantageous to the country only by a tremendous augmentation in the numbers of live stock, and the only increases up to 1906 are 289,891 horses, 1,529,168 cattle and 85,573 pigs, against which there is to allow for a decrease of 4,281,913 sheep. Arable land has gone out of cultivation simply because it ceased to pay, and the diversions from grain-growing have occurred in order to stave off ruin. The decrease in wheat alone is over 2,000,000 acres. It is not difficult to account for the decrease in the cultivation of grain crops. In the five years ended with 1875 the official average prices per quarter of eight bushels were 54*s.* 8*d.* for wheat, 39*s.* 5*d.* for barley and 26*s.* 3*d.* for oats; whereas, in the five years ended with 1906, they were 28*s.* 3*d.*, 23*s.* 10*d.* and 17*s.* 11*d.* Oats alone, as grown largely for consumption on farms, have held their ground.

Farming paid none too well in 1875; but rents and some other expenses have been greatly reduced since that year, so that a considerably lower level of prices than that of the higher of the two sets just given would suffice to restore the lost arable area. Probably that restoration would be effected if, one year with another, wheat made 40*s.* per quarter, barley 30*s.* and oats 20*s.* Somewhat high duties on imports, however, would be needed to maintain the cereals at such a level of prices, and at the present time there is no such appreciation of the importance of agricultural prosperity to the country as would be necessary to induce the nation to agree to the necessary imposts. It is true that great concern is expressed in reference to what is called the "exodus" of the rural population to the towns, as indicated by the census figures; but the fanatical dread of any increase in the cost of food overrides all considerations of even the stamina of our population, which is being undermined by the excessive migration referred to. The last census, so far as can be gathered from its faulty and changed classification, shows a decrease of males engaged in agriculture in the United Kingdom in the twenty years ended with 1901 amounting to 10.24 per cent.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The decrease is entirely that of agricultural laborers, due to the necessary economy of labor on farms, the number of farmers having been about stationary.

"Perish agriculture, so long as our people can get cheap food," is virtually the cry of the opponents of fiscal reform, and so long as this policy is maintained, farmers will have little to hope from any change in that direction. It is true that some spokesmen of the Free Food party have the hardihood to contend that the depression in agriculture is not the result of Free Trade on the ground that prices were generally well maintained for many years after the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846. But they ignore important facts bearing upon the case. The great famine in Ireland took place in 1847, after a very bad harvest in the United Kingdom, and there was another serious deficiency in 1849. Grain prices were very low for the times from 1849 to 1852, inclusive, and farming was seriously depressed. By 1853, however, the gold discoveries in California and Australia had begun to inflate prices, and the Crimean War sent them up enormously in 1854, keeping them high for two years longer. In 1857 the Indian Mutiny took place; in 1861 the American Civil War began, to last for four years; there were European wars in 1866; and the Franco-German War occurred in 1870 and 1871. After 1873 grain prices fell rapidly. For fifty-six years before the repeal of the Corn Laws wheat had been under 50*s.* per quarter in only six years; whereas, during the last twenty-one years it has been below 30*s.* in eleven years, and only twice over 35*s.*

It is perfectly true that agricultural depression was severe on several occasions when very high Protectionist duties were imposed, in consequence of various conditions which it would be out of place in this article to explain in full. The abominations of our old Poor Laws were partly accountable, and excessive rents for land had much to do with the misfortunes, while the fact that they occurred at a time when the United Kingdom often produced more grain than was needed for home consumption has also to be borne in mind.

As the United Kingdom is the only country with important markets to admit imports free of duty, the surplus products of the whole world to a great extent are shipped to our ports. Many foreign producers get remunerative returns for what they sell

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in their own markets, so that they can afford to undersell British producers in British markets. Certain of a sale for their surplus in this country, they can safely grow all that their land will produce without the fear of loss, an advantage which British producers do not share. Moreover, in using the markets of Great Britain, they are exempted from the heavy taxation levied upon British producers for the defence of the country, for the maintenance of a police force, for the upkeep of good roads, and for other channels of expenditure necessary to the peaceable, safe and convenient marketing of goods, while in addition they get preference rates on our railways. This is not free trade; it is preference trade in favor of the outsider.

Grain, flour, cattle, sheep, meat, dairy produce, hay, straw, vegetables, fruit and flowers from foreign countries and British colonies swamp the markets of the United Kingdom, fresh milk being the only product of the farm not subjected to an unfair competition which renders the profit of farming the most miserable pittance.

There is a great desire among British politicians and others for the multiplication of small holdings for agricultural laborers and other men who desire to make a living on the land, and great pains have been taken to coddle the small-holdings system. But the returns from land are so miserably small that a small holder, as a rule, has proverbially to do the work of two men for the earnings of one. Men of exceptional shrewdness, industry and thrift do better than this; but not a few fail utterly. In short, under existing conditions large and small cultivators of the soil alike find it difficult to "make ends meet."

Moreover, the financial pressure upon farmers continues to increase, in consequence of the annual passing of measures of bastard socialism which add to the already distressing burden of the rates, mainly paid in rural districts by the occupiers of land. At the time of writing Bills for the multiplication of small holdings in England and Scotland, respectively, are passing through the House of Commons, and both provide for the compulsory taking of land from farmers to divide into small holdings, while the English measure proposes to charge the expenses of administering the scheme and any losses that may occur upon the rate-payers. In other words, if not saved from spoliation by the House of Lords, Scottish farmers holding over 150 acres

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

will be liable to leave an indefinite proportion of their means of living, and English farmers of any acreage a part, or even the whole, in order to set small holders up in business, while the latter may be called upon to pay heavily for the carrying out of an undertaking by which they will be wronged.

It would be outside the limits of the subject under notice to describe at length other provisions of these oppressive measures, one of which would empower public authorities to acquire land from owners in England by compulsory hiring at rents fixed by an official arbitrator, while in Scotland a Land Court would be authorized to order any owner of land to let portions of it with fixity of tenure at rents valued by the Court to small holders selected by official commissioners. These facts are mentioned in order to show how little consideration the great majority now in power in the House of Commons pay to the rights of land-owners and farmers.

If small holdings are multiplied to the extent desired by the Government, there will infallibly be a disastrous failure among old and new small holders alike, as the majority of those who now hold not over fifty acres—over two-thirds of the occupiers of land in Great Britain—pay their way only by selling their produce directly to consumers. As it is, the competition among them for customers is severe enough, and it is obvious that if they were doubled in number, in the course of a few years, there would be far too many of them in proportion to the number of their customers.

From one point of view this proposed multiplication of small holders of land is intimately connected with the fiscal question; for when these little farmers find how poor a living they can obtain from the land, they will almost certainly clamor for protection as the only means of saving them from ruin. That they would be supported in such a demand by the great majority of English farmers there is no doubt, as the Central Chamber of Agriculture, consisting mainly of delegates from provincial Chambers, representing nearly the whole of England, has passed a resolution in favor of Mr. Chamberlain's scheme of fiscal reform, while no chamber affiliated to the central institution has declared against it. In Scotland, where the farmers are mainly producers of meat, milk and cheese, fiscal reformers obtain less support.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As to Irish farmers, it can be stated on good authority that they generally desire Protection, and that, in private conversation, they make no secret of their sympathy with Mr. Chamberlain's proposals. But they are held in leading-strings by their Parliamentary representatives, who, with a few other public men, act as their spokesmen; and by these men, or the great majority of them, everything is subordinated to Home Rule and hostility to the Unionist Party, of which Mr. Chamberlain is a prominent leader. Therefore, the sympathy of Irish farmers with that politician's proposals have very little chance of public expression. When the process of converting them into owners of their farms has been completed, it is probable that they will no longer submit to be gagged on this subject.

It has been reasonably suggested that the farmers of the United Kingdom can hardly feel any great enthusiasm in relation to Mr. Chamberlain's scheme, unless they regard it as "the thin edge of the wedge." He has not pinned himself to details at all precisely; but his provisional proposals consist of a duty not exceeding 2*s.* per quarter of eight bushels on grain, excepting maize; a higher duty in proportion on flour; a duty of five per cent. *ad valorem* on meat (excepting bacon), dairy produce, poultry, eggs, vegetables and fruit; and duties varying in proportion to the amount of labor involved in their production, but averaging ten per cent. on manufactured goods. Presumably fat cattle and sheep would be reckoned as meat. These duties would apply to imports from foreign countries, while there would be preference in favor of imports from British colonies. To compensate consumers for any possible rise in the cost of food caused by the duties, Mr. Chamberlain proposes substantial reductions in the duties on tea and sugar, and possibly on tobacco.

It is obvious that the duties would not directly benefit home producers unless they raised prices, and, as there have been variations much greater than 2*s.* per quarter in the prices of grain without affecting our supplies, the probability is that this small duty would not have any considerable effect. During the last decade the annual average price of wheat has varied from 23*s.* 1*d.* to 34*s.* per quarter, and imports were well maintained at the lower price. Probably the world's wheat area would have been contracted if the price had remained at the lower level for three or four years; but the acreage continued to increase in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the five years ending with 1903, when the range of yearly averages was 25*s.* 8*d.* to 26*s.* 11*d.* Last year the average was 28*s.* 3*d.*, and if sellers of foreign wheat had then had to pay 2*s.* in duty, the return would still have been greater than it was in 1902, 1899, 1896, 1895 or 1894. A duty of six cents per bushel, in all probability, would not induce growers in the United States, Argentina or any other large exporting country to reduce their acreage of wheat, or even check its expansion; and unless the area ceased to advance in proportion with the world's population of wheat consumers, there would be no reason to expect a rise in price.

But if the proposed duty would not raise the price of wheat, what advantage to our colonies would there be in the proposed preference? By inducing them to grow more wheat for a time, the preference, indeed, might prove injurious to them by lowering the price of wheat.

That the British Empire could feed its people there is no doubt; but it is equally certain that such a result will not be attained with prices for foodstuffs as low as they have been in recent years. At such prices wheat production, even in Canada, has increased very slowly, the gain in Manitoba and the Northwest having been partly balanced by a reduction in Ontario. It has grown even more slowly in Australia, where frequent droughts render it a hazardous enterprise; and in New Zealand, the only country besides the Netherlands which grows about as much wheat per acre as Great Britain, the area has been reduced.

The only benefit which British farmers would have reason to expect from a 2*s.* duty on wheat would be a reduction of taxation, in consequence of the handsome revenue which the duty would produce.

An extra duty on flour, as already explained, would benefit farmers in the United Kingdom by increasing the supply of milling offals; but the case of barley is similar to that of wheat, our markets having been repeatedly flooded with foreign barley while the average price in this country was more than 2*s.* per quarter lower than it has been in other years. On oats the proposed duty would be much higher in proportion to price than in the case of either wheat or barley, and it is probable, therefore, that the impost would be in part paid by the British consumer.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A tax of five per cent. on foreign meat, excluding bacon, would average less than one farthing per pound. On cheese also it would be barely one farthing per pound, as a rule, while on butter it would be only about a halfpenny per pound. As greater differences in prices have failed to affect the almost constant increase in imports of these commodities, or at least of meat and butter, there is no reason to expect that the duty would raise prices. The same remarks apply to vegetables and fruit.

On the other hand, duties on manufactured goods, including agricultural machines, averaging ten per cent., would almost certainly raise the prices of such commodities, including, of course, those of home production; and it is not unlikely that British farmers would lose more by this advance than they would gain by the duties on farm produce. But the revenue derived from the duties on all the articles would be a sum sufficiently great to allow of a substantial reduction in the taxation of the people of all classes.

Mr. Balfour's proposal of power to the Government to impose duties on imports from any country in retaliation for a high tariff on British exports, and to facilitate arrangements for reciprocity, has not received much attention from farmers, so far as can be judged from the proceedings of their associations. This is not surprising, because, while British farmers are not exporters to any very considerable extent, Mr. Balfour, in the first instance, pandered to popular prejudice by repudiating all intention of putting duties on food. The repudiation was illogical, as the power of treating for reciprocity with such countries as the United States, Russia and Argentina would be insignificant if retaliation could not be threatened in relation to exports of food from those countries. Recently, however, Mr. Balfour has come more into line with Mr. Chamberlain by admitting that the taxation of food might be advisable under certain circumstances.

But if any definite scheme of taxing imports of manufactures, without putting any duties on imports of agricultural produce, should ever be put forward, it would receive plenty of attention from British farmers, as they would rise in indignation against such an outrageous injustice. It is not by any means certain, however, that they would not derive more direct advantage from a reasonable and extensive campaign in favor of reciprocity than

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they would obtain from the operation of Mr. Chamberlain's proposals, apart from retaliatory discrimination. It is true that Mr. Chamberlain, in his speeches, has often hinted at retaliatory measures; but his plan of preference to the colonies, if realized, would to a great extent reduce the power of treating for reciprocity. For example, in such treating with the United States, preference to Canada would be a serious obstacle to a satisfactory arrangement, and might prove an insuperable impediment. British negotiators would be weak enough in treating with the United States, if prohibited from taxing food heavily, if necessary to successful negotiation, without the additional disadvantage of colonial preference. On the other hand, they would occupy a position of great strength, if free from both these handicaps. For, taking the average values for five recent years, over 62 per cent. of American exports are found to have consisted of products of agriculture, mainly food, and 40.7 per cent. of the total exports of the United States have been shipped to the United Kingdom.

Again, it may well be asked, what would become of colonial preference if any great commercial or agricultural country, now maintaining a high tariff against the United Kingdom, should be induced to agree to reciprocity to the extent of complete Free Trade? The nation would not stand the maintenance of Protection merely for the sake of giving preference to the Colonies, and yet if such countries as the United States and Argentina could be induced to trade freely with the United Kingdom, any value inherent to preference to Canada, for example, would be almost entirely annihilated.

British live stock, beef, mutton, bacon, hams, certain kinds of cheese, outdoor fruit, hothouse fruit and flowers, and potatoes are of exceptionally high quality, and would find markets in many countries, if it were not for the high wall of hostile tariffs, relieving the frequently glutted home markets, and thus raising the prices of products sold for home consumption. This aspect of the fiscal question has been almost entirely ignored; but its consideration justifies the opinion to the effect that British farmers would have a better prospect of substantial advantage from the operation of a policy of retaliation conducing to reciprocity with foreign countries, without preference to our Colonies, than from Mr. Chamberlain's scheme.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Cobden's great movement in favor of Free Trade was begun and carried to a successful issue under the supposition that all other countries would follow the example of the United Kingdom. How utterly that idea has been falsified by experience it is not necessary to state. If it had been realized, there would not be any fiscal question in the country at the present time; for there is hardly any room for doubting that Free Trade throughout the world would have been in the past, as it would be for the future, the most prosperous of all conditions for the nation at large. Nearly sixty years of trial must be regarded as affording conclusive evidence that it will never be brought about by example. It is not too much to say, indeed, that this Quixotic example is the greatest hindrance to the realization of the ideal state of commerce; for, so long as the United Kingdom, with sublime absurdity, maintains a policy of preference against itself and in favor of all other countries they will not throw away the generous gift.

On the other hand, trade with the United Kingdom is of such transcendent importance to other countries that there is good reason to believe that the operation of a firm policy of reciprocity, backed by retaliation in fiscal arrangements when necessary, would lead up steadily towards Free Trade between this country and all others, and ultimately, it may be hoped, to the like system of commerce between the other countries themselves.

In the mean time, as the necessary basis of treating, a substantial tariff, most of all on food products, should be framed. If it failed to produce the desired result, it would at least be better than one-sided Free Trade for agriculturists and all other producers in the United Kingdom, including workmen as well as employers, as the home trade would be vastly developed; and the great revenue derived from customs duties would give relief to all taxpayers, whether producers or not. On the other hand, if, in course of time, the proposed policy should lead up to Free Trade throughout the world, farmers must be prepared to take their chance of results with other producers. The prosperity of the masses of the population in that event would be so great that farmers would probably be compensated for having once more to encounter a world-wide competition; or, if not, the country would be well able to afford arrangements for maintaining the well-being of the agricultural population.

WILLIAM E. BEAR.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE CATHOLIC LAITY AND THE REPUBLIC.

BY A CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

I.

After the explicit and authoritative presentation, by Cardinal Gibbons, of the Catholic side of the controversy raised by the action of the Protestant synods which impeached the loyalty of American Catholics, it might seem that the last word has been said on our behalf. The ministers, however, made their appeal to "the great mass of our Roman Catholic fellow citizens, whose intelligent loyalty we do not desire to question, to assert their rights to think in harmony with the governmental idea of their own country instead of the un-American ideas of the old countries." In view of this exhortation, it will not be, perhaps, considered out of place that some voice from the Catholic laity be permitted a word on the subject. Besides, there is one significant feature of Papal teaching which will profitably bear a little more comment than has been given to it by either party.

The present writer has the saving sense sufficiently developed to warn him against emulating the historic "Three Tailors of Tooley Street," who opened their memorial with, "We, the people of Great Britain": he does not profess to be the spokesman of the American Catholic laity. He does claim, however, to be a fair type of the genus. Born and bred in the Catholic Church, to which he unalterably belongs, occupying, during a period long enough to turn black locks to gray, a responsible position in the service of the United States which has brought him, publicly and privately, into close contact with prominent Catholic laymen of every State in the Union, he may, without presumption, offer his views as fairly representative. He can add that, on the present question, he has taken more pains than most busy laymen to become acquainted with the subject.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We must, in the first place, acknowledge the handsome compliment paid by the Protestant synods to our "intelligent loyalty"; though one is puzzled to reconcile the adjective with the accompanying imputation that we do not know the teachings of our own Church as well as these gentlemen do. How unflattering is this estimate of our information appears when we find that their knowledge of Catholic doctrine is far below that which generally prevails, nowadays, among educated non-Catholics who discuss our beliefs in print. Now what are the grounds upon which they who impugn our loyalty rest their charge that, until the Roman Church frankly changes her doctrine, the admission of Catholics to high offices in the State is a menace to American liberties? The grounds are that the union of Church and State is a Catholic principle; that history shows that Rome has approved of religious persecution; and that the doctrine of "Papal infallibility would seem to preclude the idea of retraction of dogma or decree"; that Catholics are bound to obey the Pope in all things; and, as a make-weight, we are told that the Pope maintains his claims to the temporal power against the Kingdom of Italy, and desires to be recognized as a great power among the nations.

In the above statement there is just enough truth to account for the distrust and suspicion entertained by our Protestant friends; and enough error to render inexcusable the conduct of any educated man who would advance these statements as a reason for summoning up the spirit of religious discord from the oblivion in which American good sense and love of liberty have buried it. That the Pope does teach the ideal of human society to be the union of Church and State no Catholic may deny. It was the only conceivable idea in the Middle Ages; it has been proclaimed by Pius IX, reiterated by Leo XIII and rejuvenated by Pius X in his recent address to the French episcopate. This, certainly, is not a doctrine that falls sweetly upon the ears of American Catholics. How they regard it may be gathered from the silence in which it is passed over by all ranks of our clergy, a silence which is due not to astute calculation, but to strong attachment to American conditions and principles. True also it is that Rome clings to the vanished temporal power; but what that fact has to do with the loyalty of American Catholics is by no means obvious, and the Protestant synods have not elucidated the con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nection. Rome does crave to obtain political recognition from the great nations; she would be ready to pay a high price for it; I shall go further and say that I believe Rome has been often ready to pay much too high a price for it. Roman bureaucrats, administrators and diplomats have more than once induced the Holy See to buy the support or favor of secular statesmen at a rate incompatible with the best interests of the Church and the eternal principles of justice. The assertion that Rome has persecuted for heresy, as every Protestant Church, the Quakers excepted, has done, cannot, I believe, be truthfully denied. The plea by which some writers seek to exculpate her—that heretics were never killed for purely religious error, but only for tenets that, besides being heretical, were also subversive of the social order—does not hold good universally. The easy "*Tu quoque*" argument against Protestants, that they persecuted as relentlessly as ever did any Catholic Power, I shall not urge upon our present accusers. They can evade it, as far as the present controversy is concerned, by taking the position assumed by one of them who retorted to a Catholic clergyman: "In pointing to the State Churches of Europe, you are only calling attention to the broken shackles which we have thrown off."

If all these admissions are to be made on our side, where, then, is the leaven of error in the charges urged against us? Where do the grounds of the indictment against twelve or thirteen millions of Americans fail? In the first place, our accusers have fallen into a blunder, unpardonable in anybody who would undertake publicly to discuss Catholic doctrines. They say that the doctrine of Papal Infallibility would seem to preclude the idea of retraction in dogma or decree. The looseness of their phraseology convicts them of incompetence. A dogma is a doctrine which the Catholic Church presents to her members as being contained in Revelation. The claim of infallibility means that the Pope, and the Pope alone, and he only when speaking under certain rarely fulfilled conditions which guarantee that the supreme prerogative of the Church is engaged and is responsible for the teaching, cannot err. Outside the limited orbit of such teaching there is a whole encyclopædia of doctrines and discipline which may, and in many instances have, become the subject of "decrees" that are unprotected by the prerogative of infallibility, and are, therefore, revocable and changeable. And precisely in this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

latter class are to be found the most famous Papal utterances regarding the relations between the Church and State. Doctrines on this point that once were propounded by Popes have been tacitly revoked in a subsequent day, and the same thing may happen again. An example apposite to the present discussion is to be found by comparing the famous Bull of Boniface VIII, "*Unam Sanctam,*" with the Encyclical of Leo XIII on the Constitution of States. The Protestant synods do not seem to be familiar with these documents. The mediæval Pontiff declared, on the strength of a Scriptural text which to the lay eye seems a ridiculously inadequate base for the tremendous claim raised upon it, that both the spiritual and the material sword, meaning both the supreme spiritual and the supreme civil authority, are vested in the Church; the latter sword "to be used by the hands of kings and soldiers, but under and subject to the spiritual authority"; that the man who claims that the civil authority is not in the power of Peter does not understand the words of the Saviour. Here, then, is the doctrine that the State derives its authority from the Church. Now let us turn to Leo XIII, who speaks after the rise of the modern spirit of liberty and democracy has assisted the churchman to understand more clearly than did the mediæval theologian the true character of the Church. He distinctly declares that the State derives its authority directly from God, not from Peter's successor; that the State, or civil power, is set over human things, while the Church is set over divine things; that each power in its own realm is supreme and independent. This signal instance of radical change in Papal teaching disposes of the chief *whereas* advanced by our opponents. Their second essential position, that good Catholics are bound slavishly to obey the Pope in all his commands, has been attended to by the Cardinal; so we need not go over that ground again. Any one who desires honestly to learn what is really Catholic doctrine on the sovereignty of conscience, so grossly travestied by the Protestant synods, may consult Newman's famous "Letter to the Duke of Norfolk," published in the course of the controversy raised by Gladstone's "Vaticanism" pamphlet.

II.

If the sole purpose of this paper were merely to expose the unsoundness of the platform on which the Protestant ministers

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

planted the guns intended by them to throw into the arena of American public life an explosive shell charged with sectarian strife the writer might close here; and it would scarcely have been worth while to solicit the attention of the reader. But his purpose is candidly to thresh out the whole question. We are familiar in this country with the cleverly drawn Congressional bill or franchise grant which contains one little clause, more pregnant than all the rest, running counter to the tenor of the other parts which have been introduced merely to allay suspicion or disarm opposition. In like fashion, one provision of the amended Papal doctrine is of a character to justify non-Catholics in asking whether, notwithstanding the admission that the State is supreme and independent, the Pope does not still reserve to himself the right to interfere actively in the relations of Catholics with the national government. And if this question must be answered in the affirmative, it is incumbent on us to convince our fellow citizens that there exists a force which may be counted on to successfully oppose any pernicious action of this sort. His Eminence has strongly insisted that we may subscribe to the fundamental article of English Protestantism that "the Pope of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm," but he is careful to add the very significant qualification, "*If it be understood of the realm of purely temporal affairs.*" But between the purely spiritual and the purely temporal realm there is "the twilight zone," where both Church and State put forth claims; and the Cardinal frankly acknowledges that a conflict here is within the range of possibility. Then he hastily drops the subject, with the observation that the American concept of government puts this hypothesis outside the range of possibility. I share his conviction that the American Government will never take any measures that would infringe our religious liberty. The possibility of danger lies elsewhere. The Pope holds that, in those affairs which are the common concern of both powers, the State is bound to yield to the Church, and that in case of dispute he, the Vicar of Christ, is the court of final resort to determine the right. Now, to this claim join another co-ordinate doctrine, *i. e.*, that, as the supreme teacher of morals he possesses the right to decide what line of conduct duty imposes upon Catholics in any given circumstances. A moment's reflection will show that these two principles in combination may be stretched so as to cover almost the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

entire civic life of a Catholic. The "twilight zone" embraces, among other things, ecclesiastical property, endowments for charity, wills containing bequests for religious purposes, marriage, the legitimacy of children, provision for the religious needs of the army and navy; and, students of history need not be reminded, the question of the exemption of the clergy from the civil jurisdiction. There are few political questions outside purely economical affairs that do not involve a moral issue. Any war in the eyes of the Pope touches upon spiritual things if the success of either belligerent, in his judgment, will, anywhere on the globe, entail injury or gain to the world-wide Church. In fact, when the enormous sweep of these two claims is fully surveyed, the concession that all purely temporal affairs are outside Papal jurisdiction seems to be merely nominal, as far as the Catholic conscience is concerned. If, at any political crisis in any country, Rome should believe it to be her interest to exercise spiritual pressure on the Catholic body, expert canonists and theologians would promptly bring forth an imposing array of arguments and precedents to prove that the occasion required the Holy Father, in the exercise of his office as Supreme Pastor, to explain to his faithful children their duty.

It may be said, it *is* said, that the wisdom and virtue of the Roman Pontiff, along with the Divine guidance which the Church enjoys, will always prevent him from overstepping in crises of this kind the rightful bounds of his authority. But, as Lincoln said, we cannot escape history. And history warns us that, outside the comparatively narrow field in which, Catholics firmly believe, the infallibility of the Church is guaranteed by the indefectible Promise, we have no assurance that Rome, in her executive and administrative agencies, may not make serious mistakes, or advance claims that justice and the eternal principles of which the Church is the guardian do not ratify. The Providential protection which safeguards the Church appears nowhere more conspicuously than in the signal manner in which it has turned to her ultimate advantage the errors and the frailties of the human agents who, at various periods, have managed her affairs. We have already noticed an instance where Rome exceeded her rights, according to Rome's own subsequent tacit acknowledgment. Theoretically, at least, we have no assurance that the future shall not resemble the past. The probabilities that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

similar trespasses may occur in the future are enormously reduced, but as they are not entirely negligible, non-Catholics of a certain type will continue to harp upon them and periodically raise the alarm of Vaticanism to our prejudice. What gives vitality and color to suspicion is that Roman officials of the ecclesiastico-political kind, who are diplomats or bureaucrats first and ministers of the Gospel second, show themselves too closely wedded to the ideas of monarchism, absolutism and the union of Church and State. They still dream of political recognition for the Church from the great Powers. They are still influenced by the ideals of the seventeenth century, when the sovereign in Catholic countries was absolute and the people counted scarcely at all. They are slow to see that the age of privilege is past and that the Church must henceforth trust to her own spiritual powers, with which, unaided by worldly powers, she once conquered the civilized world. The slightest advance made by a monarch or statesman, be he Catholic or Protestant, throws them into a flutter of eager expectancy; and they are prone to make the State's relations with the Vatican, rather than the strength of Catholicism among the people, the measure of the Church's prosperity in any country. This undue valuation of secular friendship has manifested itself, not with the happiest results, in recent years. The hope of obtaining some sort of political recognition by the Court of England has been a will-o'-the-wisp to the Vatican since the days of Napoleon. Twice, to please the British Government, Rome thrust her hand into Irish politics; first, in the matter of the *Veto,* when she desired to give the English Cabinet a voice in the choice of Irish bishops; and, again, during the fiercest struggle of the Land League and Parnell times, when Leo XIII, at the solicitation of English influence, condemned the Plan of Campaign and forbade Irish Catholics to contribute to a fund for the Protestant leader. Still more recently the Pope brought pressure to bear on the Catholic party in Germany, in order to sway their vote to support the Emperor's policy in a purely politico-economic question. We might easily construct a hypothetical case, in which some foreign Power would offer to establish an embassy at the Vatican and receive a Nuncio, on condition that the Pope would undertake to control, in some specified direction, the strength of the Catholic vote in America. Would Rome undertake to pay the price? Everybody will answer

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this question in his own sense. Personally, I would not trust the average ecclesiastical politician if exposed to this temptation; and there have been Popes who, if we may reason from their acts, would not have shrunk from the bargain. That Pius X could be persuaded to lend himself to such a scheme I firmly believe to be impossible. But the personal character of a Pope is a transitory factor in Roman administration.

Here a champion of the Protestant synods flings down his NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW and devoutly exclaims: "Verily the Lord has delivered them into our hands; here is a frank acknowledgment that the Roman menace actually casts its sinister shadow over the Republic." Patience, friends, and let us examine all the forces in the situation. One of them, whose existence you have had the courtesy to acknowledge, is the intelligent loyalty of the great mass of American Catholics.

The stick upon which the scarecrow of Vaticanism is constructed is the false idea that Catholics are bound slavishly to obey the Pope in everything he pleases to command. We have seen that this is not Catholic doctrine. But, Protestants may reasonably reply, theory is one thing and practice is another. What if a Pope should again exceed his rights? The crucial question is whether your fellow countrymen could trust the Catholic conscience to stand for its rights in the face of Papal aggression. No student of history can doubt that, if occasion should arise, the conscience of American Catholics, in union with what, for want of a better name, we might call "the lay spirit," would not be found wanting. By "the lay spirit" I mean patriotism, the love of liberty and independence, the sense of justice and hatred of usurpation or oppression. This is the dual power which, in every age, has opposed, and ultimately defeated, churchmen who endeavored unduly to extend their authority over civil affairs. It was born ages before Luther and the Reformation. Pope Boniface, who did not love it, and who described it from its excesses rather than from its beneficent manifestations, grants it a very high antiquity; and he observed that it did not belong exclusively to the laity, for many of the clergy shared it. To this spirit we owe it that the claims of the Papacy as they stand in the Bull of Boniface have been trimmed down to the modest proportions which they wear in the teachings of Leo XIII. Is it possible for any intelligent person with a college boy's knowledge

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of European history to fancy that any Catholic ruler, or any Catholic people, or any Catholic population of any country, would permit their political course to be dictated by Rome to the injury of their country's interests? When, for instance, the Pope denounced *Magna Charta,* did the Catholic Barons or the Catholic Archbishop tamely submit to his dictates? When, somewhat later, another Pope espoused the claim of the Plantagenets to Ireland and Scotland against Bruce, the Irish and the Scots flouted his censures. In a very different age another Pope actively assisted Spain against Elizabeth; he gave his blessing to the great fleet invincible that was to crush the liberties of England. In 1588 the English Catholics had no reason to love Elizabeth; but, when the Armada approached in the Pope's name, the Catholics of England, to a man, rallied round her. As Green says, all the most warlike counties were Catholic; and when the stranger came the Catholic gentry led their tenantry to the muster of Tilbury; of the nobles and squires not one proved a traitor; the great Catholic lords brought their vessels up alongside of Drake, and when the bulldogs of the sea rushed upon their quarry they were led by stout old Howard of Effingham. In short, as Green tersely puts it, "the loyalty of the Catholics decided the fate of Philip's scheme." And grown-up persons shudder to think of what might have happened had William McKinley been a Catholic! The histories of France and Germany would lose many a chapter if we were to tear out of them all the pages that record the resistance made by Catholics to the claims of Rome, when Rome was incomparably more formidable on account of her political resources and interests than she is to-day. On the few occasions when in late years she did, on a greatly diminished scale, make essay to carry the conscience of a Catholic people the effort ended in dismal failure. Even docile Ireland proved intractable. The Veto project was killed by O'Connell and some other laymen who raised the country against it. In that agitation the Irish leader used an expression which is sure to be heard like a slogan if ever English-speaking people receive any political instructions from the Vatican: "We will take our religion, but we will not take our politics from Rome." That homely phrase is compendious history and safe prophecy. The attempt of the Pope during the Land League times failed in its purpose, but it struck the hardest blow ever given to the influence of the Irish clergy over the people.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If these things be done in the green wood, what would be done in the dry—in this country where the spirit of liberty and independence is the breath of our nostrils? It was very well known to American Catholics that, during the Spanish War, the sympathies of Rome were with our opponent. Our feeling on that point was, So much the worse for Rome! The Protestant minister who fancies that Papal sympathy with Spain would have the slightest influence on the patriotism of American Catholics knows his Catholic fellow countrymen only from books. I wish he had heard once or twice, as I have heard a hundred times, the curses not loud, but deep, with which Catholic laymen and even clergymen received the story that an American prelate resident in Rome during the Spanish War contributed to a fund started there to present a ship to the Spanish Government. If my readers will permit me to relate a personal recollection of that time, I would recall a conversation that I had, when the war was imminent, with a staunch Catholic of Irish blood who held a commission in a State regiment. The subject was precisely the duty of obedience to the Pope. He said that he would obey the Pope in everything; for, though at first sight he himself might not think that what the Pope ordered was right, yet, on second thought, he would see that the Pope was the better judge, and so he would accept the Pope's judgment in the matter. "Very well," I replied, "let us suppose that war will break out between us and Spain. The Pope will believe that the Catholic Church will suffer badly if Spain is beaten; so he will forbid all American Catholics, under pain of excommunication, to take part in the war. What will you do? Throw up your commission?" "What will I do?" he snorted back. "I'll tell the Pope to mind his own *blessed* business—then go out and help to give the Dagoes 'Hail Columbia.'" And he did. There spoke the lay spirit, as it spoke in Bruce and Howard and a thousand others in the past.

III.

Our Protestant friends who have provoked this discussion have, in their own way, imitated the methods of cloistered theologians who, on the support of Boniface and other Popes, set themselves to spinning out of books and their own brains cobwebs to control the mighty forces of life. They have considered the question of Catholic loyalty after the fashion of the doctrinaire who, starting

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from some narrow principle, more or less incorrect, ignores every other qualifying principle or fact, and in this way arrives at a theoretical conclusion upon which the facts take their revenge by proving it to be ridiculous. The rulers of the Church frequently did not sufficiently discriminate between the constitution of the Church and the ideals and institutions of their own day. But by the process of living on and by the logic of facts, the spirit and essential supreme law of the Church's being obliged their successors to abandon the false or obsolete position: the divine endures, the human perishes. The old ideas and policies maintain themselves stubbornly, which gives color to the complaint that the Church is behind the age, as she is now said to be out of touch with democracy; and, indeed, it would seem that the ancient ideas of the age of absolutism and privilege still haunt her bureaucracy. But hopeful Catholics see in the lay spirit one of the Providential correctives for this human defect. American Catholics yield to none in their love for their Church. They love her so much, and they so thoroughly believe that her Founder endowed her with spiritual power entirely adequate to the discharge of her mission, that they listen reluctantly to the principle that she requires the support of the State to carry on her work. They believe that one of the achievements in store for American Catholicism is to demonstrate that the truest, best condition for the Church, in a world where neither statesmen nor churchmen are angels, is one of complete independence. They hope that, as a consequence of this object-lesson, future Papal teachings will exhibit no traces of the claim to the support of the secular arm for the spiritual interests of Him whose Kingdom is not of this world.

American Catholics keenly resent anything that savors of the intrusion of worldly methods or worldly motives into the administration of religious affairs. If the Protestant synods were inspired by the cunning of Mephistopheles, instead of inveighing against the loyalty of Catholics, they would set themselves to encourage Rome to coquette with our political men, to intrigue for political recognition of her Representative, to show herself willing to trade the things of God for the things of Cæsar. This would be the very shortest and surest way to hurt the spiritual authority of the Church in this country.

There is, however, no danger that Rome will be misled by any unwise or designing individuals or coteries to make any false step

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in this direction, as Sixtus V was deluded into believing that the English Catholics would rise against Elizabeth at his bidding just as soon as the first Spanish ship touched English soil. Roman administrators will not allow themselves to make any serious miscalculations of the national temper from the boundless docility of the hierarchy. Rome knows, for instance, exactly what the recent sudden rise in the volume of Peter's Pence means; and has no illusions that ecclesiastical honors conferred on the clergy are taken by the laity as a sign of love for our country and its spirit. It will take years before that spirit will enjoy any favor in the eyes of the Curia; for before the Curia can overcome its suspicions and distrust of us, it must liberate itself from the domination of bygone ideals and open its eyes to the fact that if the Church is to win the future her victories must be won not in the salons and the chancelleries, but in the factories, the slums, the marts; not by silk-clad diplomatists, but by apostles among the people.

Thoughtful men among us have been gladdened by the various measures of Pius X, which indicate that he sees the necessity of liberating the Church from the burden of useless forms that survive in her machinery. Another measure is credited to Pius X, which will call forth the gratitude of Americans, even though it indirectly bears upon the relations between the Catholic Church here and the American people at large. This is his resolution to enforce in Italy his decree that the clergy must spend an hour every Sunday and holiday throughout the year in teaching the catechism to their people. The internal welfare of the Church here, and her reputation before the country, require that she absorb and assimilate the great volume of foreign Catholics which immigration is pouring on our shores, and by making them conscientious Catholics make them law-abiding citizens fit to enjoy and exercise American freedom. This duty to the State the Church is performing to the satisfaction of judicious public opinion.

A CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHITE SLAVES IN AFRICA.

A SAILOR'S STORY.

BY THOMAS WENTWORTH HIGGINSON.

THERE has come into my possession, among some old family papers, the authentic personal narrative, now about a century old, of one of the most picturesque and interesting explorers ever stranded from an American vessel on the desert coast of Africa. Becoming a captive alternatively of Moors and of negroes, and often changing masters, this man wandered on foot for nearly three years over a range of country then unexplored by white men, his footsteps extending more than a thousand miles and including that hitherto mysterious centre of African life, Timbuctoo. Ever since the sixteenth century, when Leo Africanus wrote his famous description of Africa, the tradition of this town had remained unconfirmed; and even Mungo Park, after reaching within fifteen days' journey of it, had left uncompleted the search in 1796 and died without the sight. It was in 1811 that it was first reached by the ignorant sailor whose narrative lies before me, dictated to a white friend, since he could neither read nor write. He had spent there nine months of his three years of African bondage, from which he was finally rescued by the combined action of the British and American consuls in the year 1812. After remaining for a time in Tangier, he went to Cadiz, and there became well known to an uncle of mine on my mother's side, Mr. Samuel Appleton Storrow, who was then travelling in that region and who was afterwards a citizen of Virginia, where he married into the well-known Carter family and held important public office at a later period. It is from his children that I have this manuscript. Storrow was interested, as were all who met this man, by his latent intelligence; so he wrote down with patience the narrative of an enslaved white man toiling over a half-desert Continent as a barefooted slave.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In later years the manuscript passed, somehow, through the hands of Jared Sparks, then Instructor in history in Harvard University, but not yet Professor, where it met the strange lot which was liable to befall the historic documents entrusted to that excellent man, and was dealt with as freely as were Washington's letters in the same hands, as will be remembered. The reprint of the manuscript, as it appeared in THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for May and July, 1817, is so transformed as to be practically re-written; the sentences being rearranged and recombined, enlarged or contracted in a way common enough at that time among historians, from Bancroft downward, but now utterly discarded. Inasmuch as Sparks distrusted the sailor from the beginning, even upon statements since confirmed by later travellers, he had no inducement to be especially considerate, and he certainly was not.

The following parallel citation of the original manuscript and Sparks's modification will illustrate what I mean:

SPARKS,	MANUSCRIPT.
"Our voyage was sufficiently favourable till the eleventh of October, when, being on the coast of Africa, as I think, near Cape Noon, in latitude about twenty-eight, the vessel stranded on a reef of rocks, projecting out from the continent."	"In the prosecution of this voyage nothing of moment occurred until the 11th of October, at which time being on the coast of Africa &, as I imagine, in the vicinity of Cape Noon, in latitude near 28, the vessel stranded on a reef of rocks running out from the Continent."
"Being apprehensive that the ship herself might share the same fate, we threw ourselves into the water in order to swim to the land. We had no sooner reached the shore, than we were seized and made prisoners by a party of wandering Arabs, who had discovered us at a distance, and waited our approach. They rushed upon us, while we were yet in the water, and each one claimed as his own property the person, whom he had taken. We made some struggle, but without avail."	"Being apprehensive that the ship herself might share the same fate we threw ourselves into the water in order to swim to land, immediately on reaching which we were seized & made prisoners by a party of wandering Arabs, who had discerned us from a distance & awaited our approach. We were taken with some considerable struggle, each person seized falling to the lot of the seizer;—while yet in the water they rushed upon us, seized us by the hair & contended among themselves to gain & continue possession."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NARRATIVE.

"On the seventh day of May in the year 1810 sailed from New York for Gibraltar, the Ship "Charles," John Norton, Captain—in which I embarked as a common sailor—our complement was as follows, viz.:

John Norton—Master	James Davidson—Seaman
Stephen Dalby—Mate	Thomas Williams— "
Martin Clark—black man—cook	John Matthews— "
Unus—Newsum—Seaman	Nicholas —— — " a Swede
Robert Adams— "	—— Nielson— " — " &

Mr Peter Bogandus, supercargo. On the 12th of June we arrived at Gibraltar & remained there untill the middle of September, when we sailed for the Cape de Verde Islands with the same complement—the supercargo excepted. In the prosecution of this voyage nothing of moment occurred until the 11th of October, at which time, being on the coast of Africa &, as I imagine, in the vicinity of Cape Noon, in latitude near 28, the vessel stranded on a reef of rocks running out from the Continent. This disaster happened at about 6 o'clock in the morning, the darkness of the previous night & the haziness of the weather at the moment preventing us from knowing our nearness to the shore.

"The boats were immediately hoisted out but were dashed in pieces from the violence of the waves. Being apprehensive that the ship herself might share the same fate, we threw ourselves into the water in order to swim to land, immediately on reaching which we were seized & made prisoners by a party of wandering Arabs, who had discerned us from a distance and awaited our approach. We were taken with some considerable struggle, each person seized falling to the lot of the seizer; while yet in the water they rushed upon us, seized us by the hair & contended among themselves to gain & continue possession. The succeeding day, the 12th of October, the wind & sea abating—so that the vessel was left dry on the rocks,—the Arabs went on board, plundered her of everything worth taking & afterwards burnt her. Having done this, they made a distribution of us in lots, on which Dalby [mate of the vessel] & myself fell to the share of the same person. They had previously stripped us of our cloaths & we were compelled to follow them in their desultory wandering mode of life, entirely naked. They belonged to a wandering tribe in the interior & had now come, to the number of 30 or 40, to the sea coast to procure a miserable subsistence on fish. They seemed to have no object excepting that of mere existence & were most abjectedly wretched. We continued this sort of life roving from place to place along the shore for the space of a month—suffering excessively from the heat of the day & dews of the night, hunger & exhaustion; from the combined effect of which the Captain died. This took place while we were in our accustomed motion & gave the Arabs not the least thought or uneasiness—they threw the body on one side & there would have left it, had we not begged permission to bury it in the sand.

"After the above mentioned term had elapsed, the party separated

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in order to go to their several places of rendezvous in the interior, taking with them their slaves. Myself & Dalby followed our master to a place in the district of Woled doleim, where was the encampment of the rest of his tribe. Our direction was South East,—easterly,—we travelled about —— days over a sandy country, & after passing about eighty miles arrived at the rendezvous—it was merely a small cluster of tents, containing perhaps 200 people. It was chosen as a place of encampment from the soil affording some little shrubbery & one or two wells of brackish water. Everything discovered their poverty, filth, ignorance & abject misery—they had some few camels & Jackasses, which it was my duty to attend; our food (Dalby & myself) consisted of a scanty allowance of barley flour & water, their own of the same with an occasional addition of camel's milk.

"After having remained in this place about two months (it being then to the best of my recollection the latter part of the month of January 1811), I found a party formed to proceed to a place called Soudeny for the purpose of stealing Negroes. This party consisted of about thirty, myself included—they were armed with short daggers, mounted on camels & supplied with Barley flour & Water as our only food. On leaving Woled Doleim we moved south east southerly, which direction we pursued untill the end of the journey; our way laid over a country entirely sandy, which afforded water, but in one instance & that when the soil had slightly changed its character from sandy to rocky, it was bitter & slimy. After having proceeded in this manner for eighteen days, at an average pace of about fifteen miles per day, we arrived at the mountains in the vicinity of Soudeny. These mountains are of Rock & Sand & in them we hid ourselves untill opportunity should offer to seize such Negroes as might be wandering that way.

"Thirteen days we remained in our concealment without effecting anything; on the fourteenth day the people of the town, becoming apprised of our nearness, came out in a body, attacked & made prisoners of our whole party & marched us into their settlement. Immediately after our seizure the Natives seemed aware of the existence of a difference between me & my masters, which they discovered by beating & maltreating them & leaving me untouched. For the first night we were all put into the same prison & in the morning myself alone released from it—the rest remained in strict confinement during the whole of our short stay in the place.

"The soil of the vicinity of the Soudanee was very much better than that we had passed over in our journey towards it—the town itself appeared to consist of thirty or forty scattered mud houses or rather huts containing perhaps 400 or 500 Inhabitants, who hold themselves subject to the king or Wooloo of Timbuctoo. They had several springs of good water, some vegetation & some little cultivation. I observed Date Trees, & another tree bearing a large & pleasant fruit—the name of which I did not learn—likewise guinea corn, Beans, Barley, a species of Artichoke & a small black grain called in their language *Moutre*. The place & its Inhabitants were dirty & miserable, but not to so great

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an extent as were the Arabs—the children were generally naked—people of full age had a sort of cloathing in the form of a shirt, made of Wool & goats' hair, dyed blue—their arms were bows & arrows & I observed they were all marked by three scores on each cheek. I saw among them Horses, Cows, Goats, Sheep, Jackasses, Dogs, Dromedaries & Camels, all excepting the two latter animals were weak & miserable. This was the extent of the observation I was enabled to make in so short a stay, which was but a single day—at the end of which our whole party was ordered to Timbuctoo & thither proceeded under a guard of forty Negroes armed with bows & arrows. Our course was South East, which direction we continued for ten days at the rate of nearly twenty miles per day—our only rests were for a short time in the day—& in the night for sleep & food, which latter consisted of Moutre formed into a kind of Pudding & occasionally a few Ostrich Eggs, having met with the bird in our march. Our way lay over a country uneven in its face, & varying as to soil, sometimes affording shrubbery & sometimes sandy, in no part offering water or showing any marks of human existence or cultivated vegetable life. During the whole of this time my former masters were pinioned & closely guarded —I was left at large & walked in company with the Negroes or occasionally rested myself by mounting one of the camels. At the end of the tenth day we arrived at a miserable village of about fifteen mud huts, as many tents & perhaps 200 or 300 Inhabitants, who were the first human creatures we had seen since quitting Soudeny. They were naked & apparently much more abjectly miserable than the People of Soudeny,—they were distinguished by the loss of the cartilage of the nose & were not (as told me by the Arabs) subject to the Wooloo of Timbuctoo.

"Our stay there was but a day, after which we continued our march in the same direction, & after advancing for the space of two days arrived at a country materially better than the preceding. On proceeding farther the face of the country gradually ameliorated, offering frequent springs of good water, occasional villages, a better soil & a portion of cultivation.

"During the course of the fifth & sixth days the change was very material; we passed several villages, the Inhabitants of which seemed to enjoy some of the apparent comforts of life; everything seemed to denote a condition superior to that of any country through which I had hitherto passed. At the end of the sixth day our caravan arrived at its point of destination, the city of Timbuctoo—immediately on which myself & companions were thrown into prison, where I remained but for one night; the others did not leave it untill leaving the city. Having resided in this place, as will appear by the sequel, for a considerable length of time, & having had ample opportunity to ascertain, as far as lay within my own talent, the appearance of the city & customs, laws, commerce & resources of its Inhabitants, I will here narrate them faithfully—as they present themselves to my remembrance.

"Timbuctoo is built at the distance of about two hundred yards from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a river called by the natives Laparsire, & consists of probably not less than twelve thousand Inhabitants living in mud houses & generally enjoying a greater share of the comforts & necessaries of life than any other part of Africa that had at that time come under my observation. The houses, which are irregularly scattered over a space of [blank] acres, are not badly built—they are from thirty to seventy feet square, single storied & flat roofed—the sides are raised & supported without wood, being a cement composed of mud & straw. The partitions within are of the same, the rafters supporting the roof, which is of the like composition, are of the Date tree—in the whole fabric no use is made of Irons—each house has its apertures serving as windows without shutters. There appears no external difference between the different houses except in that of the Wooloo, which is more distinguished by its size than by any other quality. The Inhabitants are in air, shape & appearance very little different from those Africans commonly seen in Europe or America, excepting that their skins are of a more unvarying & deeper black; the same shape of legs & of features of the face with a general addiction to corpulency—particularly among the females. Their dress is the same among all ranks, with the slight difference that the shirt, the only garment worn, is among the poorer class blue, among the higher white; this article is occasionally manufactured of wool & goats' hair among themselves & occasionally bought of traders visiting the city from distant parts—some few wear a sort of slipper made of goat's or other skin. . . .

"In idleness of the most abject sort passed away the nine months spent in Timbuctoo, during which I generally received from the Natives that negative sort of kindness which their natures allowed them to give, but which, had it been superior, would have been embittered by the idea which always oppressed me, that I was never again to see my native country.

"At the end of the ninth month, a party of Moorish traders purchased of the Wooloo the whole party which had been taken prisoners at Soudeny, for the amount of sixteen pounds of tobacco per man, the Moors, their countrymen, were bought to be restored to freedom and myself to my former condition as their slave.

"In the early part of the month of December, 1811 (as nearly as I could imagine), our caravan left Timbuctoo—it consisted of fifteen camels & about fifty persons, comprising the purchasers, purchased, myself & a few Negro slaves. Our destination was Taudeny, to arrive at which we pursued two different directions, the one angular to the other. In the first eight days we followed the course of the river, which was due East, leading us over a good country, partially cultivated & interspersed with occasional settlements, the Inhabitants of which were employed in the same sort of agriculture as those of Timbuctoo. During this time we moved at the rate of 16 or 17 miles per day & had consequently ascended the river to the extent of 130 or 140 miles, yet even at that point the diminution in width & depth was not sufficient to induce a belief that double or treble that distance would

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reach to its source. At the end of the 8th day we halted at a small village of huts about two miles distant from the river; & as from this place we were to take a new direction & change a comparatively hospitable country for a waste of sand, we remained in it four days to refresh the camels by grazing & prepare them for the labor they were about to undertake.

"At the expiration of our term of rest the caravan resumed its march in a direction, as nearly as my recollection serves, about North, north west, having the river directly in the rear. Settlements & cultivation seemed to be confined to a narrow district bordering on the river—for immediately on quitting it every trace of animal or vegetable life disappeared; we immediately entered on an immense waste of sand, equally hostile to the one & the other—it afforded no water nor, with the exception of a very little burnt shrubbery on which the camels sometimes browsed, did we find anything, in our journey from the River to Taudeny, connected with existence or the common means of preserving it. My sole subsistence was a scanty portion of barley & water taken once a day—that of my masters was but little beyond it. The heat of the sun & of the sand, exhaustion from lack of food & from labor, rendered me in a short time unable to walk—when absolutely unable to move I was allowed to relieve myself for a short time by mounting one of the camels. At the end of the fourth day a negro child, slave to the caravan, died of hunger, thirst & fatigue;—immediately on its death its body was thrown away without the least regard. . . . On the course of the march one of the camels died of exhaustion; a portion of his flesh served us for food. In this manner did we continue our journey, in the direction originally assumed, for the term of ten days—going each day at a rate of 12 or 14 miles—when at the end of the tenth we arrived at Taudeny, of which we were a little apprised by an elevation of the ground & a slight amelioration of the soil.

"Taudeny is a miserable village of 50 or 60 huts containing apparently about 600 Inhabitants, including Strangers, of whom many resort there in Caravans for purposes of trade. The traffic is considerable, it being a rendezvous from many different places. It is governed, as I understood, by a Sheik appointed by the Wooloo of Timbuctoo to whom the place is tributary, & must have been selected as a place of settlement from its soil being better than the deserts of sand which surround it & affording one or two springs of good water—it likewise contains Salt Mines. In every respect, except the difference of size, Taudeny is the same as Timbuctoo—in manners, refinement & comfort there was no apparent difference. My masters being engaged in traffic we remained in this place four days, during which I was employed in attending the camels & preparing them for the labor they had yet to undertake. At the commencement of the 5th day our caravan renewed its march, with a destination as I understood for Heligobla. On leaving Taudeny we pursued a North west course & immediately entered on a plain of burning sand—of a character still more horrid

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than that we had passed. The allotted time for the journey being twelve days, we had placed on the camels twelve skins of water (goat skins)—one for each day—but on the second after our departure had the misfortune to burst two of them, in consequence of which we were obliged to diminish our miserable allowance & to mix it, small as it was, with the urine of the camels.

"Throughout the ten first days of this journey nothing could exceed the extent of the sufferings of myself & fellow slaves from heat, hunger, thirst & exhaustion. At the first dawn of light, the caravan commenced its march—the Moors having previously made their morning devotions—throughout the day our motion continued—at the setting of the sun we halted & received our scanty allowance of food. After this we stretched ourselves on the sand to sleep—to effect which we were always obliged to remove the upper body [garment]—the daily power of the sun impregnating it with such an excessive heat as to prevent the least repose if laying upon it. During the day the Moors directed their course by the Sun;—in this dreary waste, where nothing of vegetable or animal life appears, where the eye rests but on the sky above it & an ocean of sand about it, nothing but the Sun remains by which a daily course & direction can be observed.

"On the fourth day one of the Jackasses, which had been purchased at Taudeny, died of thirst & exhaustion, not having tasted water since leaving that place; we ate nearly all his flesh on the night of his death. On the seventh day died two negro boys, slaves brought from Timbuctoo, their privations, sufferings & death were the same as those of the woman & child before mentioned. On the eighth day died one of our Camels, who had been without water since leaving Taudeny.

"On the tenth day of this horrid existence, when nature seemed to be sinking within me, our eyes were greeted by the distant view of a change of soil, a rising ground & some little verdure. On reaching it we were partially relieved from the heat of the sand, & on the eleventh after passing a few tents regaled ourselves at a spring of good water. No one, who has not experienced like miseries, can realize the comfort which we at that moment received! On the twelfth day we reached Heligobla, the point of our destination. On arrival there I found that, on quitting Taudeny, we had left the whole of the negro territory & were now in the country of the wandering & most savage Moors.

"Heligobla is, like many other encampments of this sort of people, not a place of fixed residence, but merely a well round which tents are pitched; when the herbage in the neighborhood is exhausted by the animals grazing upon it, the tribe migrates to some little distance; when the same takes place in the spot to which they are now removed, they change to another, keeping themselves always in the vicinity of the well. The tribe consisted of about 200 persons—men, women & children inclusive, inhabiting 30 or 40 tents—they are Mahometans & as strict in religious duties as in Tangier or elsewhere. They have but little cloathing & that tattered & filthy—their faces are nearly black, their Hair long & of the same color, their faces & persons squalid

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

& dirty, & their customs & manners of the most brutal & cruel sort. They do not cultivate the ground but subsist entirely on dates & the milk & occasionally (tho' very rarely) the flesh of camels & goats, of which they rear a great number & occasionally sell them to the passing caravans. They are self governed, being commanded by a Shiek from their own number; their language is Arabick. In everything that is desirable, in all the necessaries & comforts of life, in civilization & humanity, they are much inferior to the negroes of Timbuctoo & elsewhere.

"After fourteen days' stay in this unhappy spot, I found that my master had sold me to the Shiek of the place for two camels & two bags of dates. The caravan moved onward & left me with my new master—in whose service I immediately commenced my labors, which consisted in attending & serving the camels & goats. In this employment was I confined six months without comfort & without change; my food, which consisted of goat's milk and water, was given me in a scanty allowance twice a day—my labor was incessant & unaccompanied by kindness or commiseration. The people seemed to consider injury to me as a benefit to themselves, for I received from them nothing but continued beating & insult; among their own number they were apparently satisfied with their miserable life & occasionally merry; to slaves of all descriptions they were morose & severe, but to Christians in particular they seemed most wretchedly cruel. After enduring this sad existence for the space of six months I was sold by the Shiek to one of a Caravan of Woledabusbak traders passing thro' Heligobla on their way to Lagassa (or Heligassa). I immediately commenced the journey with them to the place of their destination—the course was north west, westerly, which we continued for fifteen days at the rate of [blank] or [blank] miles per day—passing over a country infinitely better than the sandy desert from Taudeny to Heligobla—the ground was uneven, occasionally covered with low shrubbery & affording water in one or two places. We met with one or two Moorish encampments, & at the end of the fifteenth day arrived at Lagassa. This place is in every respect resembling Heligobla; the same selection of a spot in consequence of its affording water, the same migration round it, the same habits & mode of life, the same destitution of good feeling & principle are in common to them both. . . . This was the first people among whom I found (since my captivity) silver & gold known as a circulating medium—this was the result of their connexion with Traders from Wadnoon & its vicinity.

"After having remained in this place for the space of two days I was sold to a Shiek of Wadnoon for the sum of 60 dollars & immediately followed my new master to the district to which he belonged. Our course was north east, northerly, which we continued for fifteen days moving very slowly & occasionally stopping for purposes of trade. . . . We passed several encampments & met many travellers. I likewise observed several small flocks of Deer & Antelopes—at the end of the fifteenth day we arrived at Wadnoon. Nothing could exceed my sur-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prise when on entering this place I found there four of the crew of the 'Charles'—prisoners like myself. The reason of their all being centered here, although their original destination was different, was the importance & wealth of the city of Wadnoon, which made it a rendezvous for slaves from many quarters. . . .

"In this place I remained, together with my fellow slaves, for twelve months, subject throughout to the same master that had brought me thither; my employment was labor in the gardens & fields, eating once & sometimes twice a day of barley & water & dates—but of this so scantily as to oblige me for the mere support of nature to steal everything like food, which I could lay my hands on—not however without fear of punishment, under which in blows & abuse I suffered daily. During the course of this time, four months after my arrival, Dalby, the former mate of the 'Charles,' who was slave to the son of my master, finding himself exhausted by labor & privation, declared himself unable to perform some duty which was assigned to him; at this his master became exasperated, & stabbed him with his dagger so that he died almost immediately. To protect his wretched remains from the dogs myself & the rest of my fellow slaves buried him—under the sad idea that any one of us might for the same slight provocation share the same fate.

"A few months afterwards my three surviving fellow prisoners, becoming exhausted under incessant beating, insult & privation, declared their intention of escaping them by becoming Mahometans—which unhappy determination they put into effect & were consequently circumcised and placed on the same footing as the people of the country. After this my life became doubly wretched; my master, being desirous that I should follow the example of the others in the change of religion, endeavoured to prevail upon me so to do by continued persuasion & the most abusive and insupportable treatment. So severe was it that my nature must have sunk under it, had not at the end of one or two months a person appeared empowered by the consuls of the United States & of Great Britain at Mogadore to purchase such Christians as might be found in that district. After some length of time spent in bargaining, I found to my unspeakable delight that the purchase of me was effected for the sum of $105 & myself at liberty to pursue my journey with the purchaser to Mogadore. The sad resolution taken by my fellow captives prevented them from sharing with me this happiness. After one year's miserable residence at Wadnoon I commenced my journey to Mogadore in company with my purchaser & after five days' march in a West, north west direction, making a distance of about 150 miles over a country resembling that of the vicinity of Wadnoon, arrived at Santa Cruz, or as it is called by the Moors Agadeer, on the sea coast—from thence I walked on the sea shore three days—at the end of which, in the latter part of the month of August of the year 1812, I arrived at Mogadore.

Of the later history of this poor American seaman, it is only

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

known that he went finally from Cadiz to London, where he at first appeared almost as a beggar and afterwards became temporarily a hero, with eminent scholars and public men to hear and applaud his reminiscences. In telling his story over and over again, a year or two later, he undoubtedly made unconscious variations, as all illiterate men are liable to do. His story was told and retold, culminating in a large quarto book entitled "The Narrative of Robert Adams, a Sailor, who was Wrecked on the Western Coast of Africa in the Year 1810, was Detained Three Years in Slavery by the Arabs of the Great Desert, and Resided several Months in the City of Timbuctoo." The preface to the printed book is dated April 30th, 1816, this being two years later than that of the manuscript now before me, which was written out in 1814 by Mr. Storrow. It certainly is not strange that variations would have been made in so long a narrative after an interval of nearly two years; but, as to main facts, the tale has borne the test of time and will remain as a graphic testimony to the earliest condition of Western Africa.

THOMAS WENTWORTH HIGGINSON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A PERMANENT TARIFF AND EFFICIENT REVENUE SYSTEM.

ELASTIC AND ADJUSTABLE, PRECLUDING REVISION, POLITICS AND TREASURY DEFICITS.

BY COL. WILLARD FRENCH

It may safely be said that both the Congress and the country are heartily tired of tariff revision. The result of the months of work, the preceding popular agitation, the accompanying business stagnation, will be heralded from the stump in coming campaigns, from many different view-points; but whether we join with one to pronounce it an outrage and a farce—as most tariff revisions are, from some outlooks—or with another, to claim that through much tribulation the makers have entered the Kingdom of Heaven, with a tariff well done by good and faithful servants, fulfilling every campaign promise relied upon by the people who rolled up the Republican majorities, we shall all admit that business—the country—has suffered more from uncertainty, from frantic efforts to obtain or combat, from fear and stagnation, due to the tariff revision, than if it had passed through a panic —or a national election. We shall all agree that tariff revision —however the tariff is revised—is an outrage and an intolerable nuisance.

Better and better we comprehend that an effort to produce a bill which shall be, at once, a protective tariff and a tariff for revenue, must result in outrage to some, oppression to some, and antagonism from many; for in the nature of it, it cannot be otherwise. The two ends in view are so different that their aims are almost diametrically opposite. An effective protective tariff must reduce importation to the minimum—if it falls short of being absolutely prohibitive. A tariff for revenue must, on the contrary,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

induce importation in order to be productive. The original design of a tariff, as authorized by the Constitution, was for revenue only. It is true that Alexander Hamilton's desire was to prevent the patronage of foreign productions, and make the United States produce all that it consumed; but the Constitution plainly authorizes a tariff for revenue, and nothing more. It has more than once been urged, and not without support, that a protective tariff—a tariff for protection—was unconstitutional. It is only by warping, more or less, the apparent intent of the general welfare clause, that a roundabout permission may be extracted; however, the Supreme Court has more than once indirectly admitted that protection in the tariff was allowable, and the practice of a hundred years renders constitutional objection futile. But the question is yet more effectively met by the forceful suggestion of Senator Sutherland, of the Judiciary, that of necessity the United States has the inherent rights of a sovereign nation, in dealing with other nations, wholly outside of the Constitution. We have the unquestionable right, and have exerted it, to prohibit certain products of foreign nations from coming into our ports at all. We have equal right to dictate upon what terms and conditions foreign products shall come, as the act of a Sovereign Nation; distinct from the delegated powers of the Federal Government in dealing with the States and the people of the States.

Protection began long ago, in the paternal effort to develop infant industries. It has grown with the industries. It has been a constantly increasing essential element. Equally the demands for increased revenue have grown, and more and more, with each tariff revision, injustice, oppression, discrimination, have been apparent and necessary, in efforts to combine in one bill the two conflicting interests.

If we were a nation with but a few possible industries, relying upon the importation of foreign products for many of the necessities and most of the luxuries of life, it would be possible to afford those industries ample protection for development and still derive sufficient revenue from foreign importation for all practical purposes of government. But when, in our infinite resources, we do—or can—produce everything which the brain of man can conceive or his body utilize, a bill which shall protect without discrimination and at the same time afford a revenue,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is a preposterous impossibility. The frantic effort which has just been made to accomplish this impossibility will probably cost the Republican party some of its strength at the next election—just as a tariff revision a few years ago cost the Democratic party more than it was able to pay. It will doubtless be shouted from the campaign rostrum, that the leaders of the party in power, in framing this bill, are guilty of all kinds of prejudiced purposes, and many will believe it. But whether it is true or false, it is an indisputable fact that in the whole history of tariff legislation there never was such an amount of work performed as stands to the credit of the framers of the present bill. It is absolutely true, and the public will realize it better and better with each succeeding effort, that no possible combination of men could frame a tariff bill to meet the conflicting interests in the United States to-day, and in the same bill realize a revenue adequate to the increasing demands upon the treasury.

With every lapse of years between tariff revisions the conflicting claims have made the task more difficult and the result more obnoxious, and that condition must continue and steadily increase till the limit is reached and we abandon the effort to combine in one tariff bill these two antagonistic measures.

The fact is apparent that our tariff system—like many of our great systems—is largely makeshift; the offspring of the mother of invention. It is a prop which was put under the nation when limited productions rendered it possible for protection to develop infant industries, without effecting the necessities of the Government. To-day both the industries and the necessities have reached a point where the effort, if it were not so serious, would be absurd. "Infant industries" is a term which has served its day and generation, and should have been pensioned and sent home long ago. The system of protection has established a standard of prosperity among the laboring classes unrivalled in the world, and one which this nation is and always will be bound to sustain. No industry, simply gauged by years or development, has outlived the right to proper protection from foreign competition—a right established by the conditions created under the system of protection. Neither should any new or immaterial industry which is capable of holding its own or expanding, be left without the same adequate protection. It is no longer a Republican doctrine. It is the doctrine of the United States. It

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is the doctrine which has given the laborer of this country such stupendous advantage over his fellows everywhere else in the world—unless, perhaps, New Zealand, profiting by our blunders and improving on our experiments, might take issue along the same lines. It is the doctrine which results, to-day, in wages that are double and treble the wages paid for the same labor in Europe, and the resultant improvement in the mental, moral and physical condition of our laborers. Where the tariff has been manipulated to permit of exorbitant profits it has been wrong and oppressive, and by a practical and scientific tariff system such wrongs can be and must be righted. But the principle of protection is here to stay. No true American would see our laboring classes return to the conditions of Europe. The doctrine is the doctrine of the nation, and it will always be the doctrine of the nation as long as laboring classes exist.

We have laughed over the denomination of the tariff as a local issue, but it is a local issue. It is thousands of local issues. Every schedule in it is a local issue, and the thousands of issues combined make the national issue—only they do not combine. They conflict. They will continue to conflict as long as there is discrimination—just as long as protection fails of being a universal principle, consistently applied. And it cannot be universal while the necessity remains for extracting any material revenue —as compared with the colossal demands—from the same bill.

The principle of protection propounded by President Taft, is broad and comprehensive and just. It is one which would be accepted by the great majority of Democrats and Republicans, alike, if universally applied. It is the principle that the duty should measure the difference between the cost of a foreign product at our doors and the cost of the same product at home, with a fair profit allowed for the home producer. It is perfectly competent for Congress to establish that principle as the basis of all tariffs and to make it universally applicable. The result of such action would be the permanence of industry, the permanence of the present standard of prosperity of labor and security to every new industry capable of development in this country. A tariff based upon this principle could never discriminate or become oppressive to any consumer. By it, every article coming directly or indirectly from the soil and which can be reproduced, would receive adequate protection to encourage its production—

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

no more; no less. Every article manufactured, every product of the country, would receive the same protection. No more. No less. It would be absolutely guaranteed, without fear of tariff revision or complication through political revolution. It is very easily possible of accomplishment. A joint resolution by the Congress, to that effect, is all that is required.

During the debates of the extra session many hints were thrown out and some propositions openly advocated, aiming at a tariff bureau or commission, to perform the duties which would develop in at least approximating such a tariff condition. It would be unfortunate, however, if any of the theories as yet advanced should be adopted, for bureaus and commissions are fast becoming a curse to the country and it would be a pity to increase them. It is unnecessary and ought not to be. There need never again be a tariff revision, and under this system there never could be. The work would be constant, but never massed in mountains. It could easily be accomplished by legitimate committees of the Senate and the House. If the Congress has tariff experts capable of revising the entire tariff, with all its eccentricities and deviations, under the present erratic lack of system and impossible complications, in less than a year, it surely has material for standing committees to investigate the occasional applications for attention which it would receive. Such committees should be authorized to meet in joint session to consider evidence, whenever a hearing is asked, and hearings should always be possible to any who would develop a new industry and desired protection, to any where changed conditions rendered their protection inadequate, and to any who could bring evidence that one industry or another was over-protected and taking advantage of it to secure undue profits. After gathering all of the information possible upon the matter under consideration, it would be reported to the two houses, discussed and acted upon in the ordinary way, on the simple and established principle, resulting in an elastic and constantly adjustable tariff, applied to every industry alike and incapable of being brought into political issue or popular agitation. Only, it would preclude the possibility of deriving, through import duties, anything like the amount required by the Government to meet the demands upon the treasury.

Acknowledging our evident approach to this sometime cer-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tainty, many of our statesmen have admitted the possibility that the present tariff will fail to be a sufficient revenue-producer, and have suggested various means for meeting the prospective deficit. The inheritance tax, and other forms of taxation have been ably discussed, always with material objections and always with doubt as to how much they could be made to produce. The Senate has appointed a committee on the budget with a view to adjusting revenues and expenditures, and the leaders have earnestly declared their determination to inaugurate an era of rigid economy, to reduce the expenses of the Government to whatever point becomes necessary by the reduced revenues.

All this is practical wisdom in personal affairs, but strained economy is not an invariable blessing to a nation; neither will any material reduction ever be, for long, possible to a Congress which has already developed billion-dollar sessions, in keeping pace with the prosperity and progress of the nation. There are obvious ways in which comparatively small sums can be saved and ought to be saved, whether there is a surplus or a deficit in the treasury. There is not a Senator on the floor but knows of some preposterous appropriations, but if every foolish expenditure were eradicated the saving would not amount to $20,000,000, while it is estimated that in the next fiscal year the deficit may reach $160,000,000. The colossal expenses of our army and navy might attract some economist—especially if he realized that we, the ideal peace nation of the earth, are to-day expending upon war, past, present and future, more than seventy per cent. of our entire revenue; but as one of our wisest statesmen recently remarked, "The country is navy mad," and no material reduction will be made in those appropriations. The efforts to enforce economy will be along other lines—lines where, to the minds of some, present economy means future detriment to the nation.

Economy for the individual is wise, whether constrained by necessity or not, for by it he safeguards the future. Economy for the Government, along lines of public works, where the economy will be practised if at all, to any appreciable effect, is penny wisdom and should not be tolerated. It will only result in impoverishing the future.

The nation is not poor, irrespective of the state of the treasury. The cry that we must live within our income, is a false cry, for the income is precisely what Congress decides to make it. It ought

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not to be conceivable that "the greatest legislative body on the earth" can be composed of men who would wantonly, recklessly, waste the public money, and that being the case, exactly the opposite is true of the public family which is true of the private family; to wit, wise and proper expenditures should be the criterion; the *outgo* should regulate the *income;* in cutting the garment according to the cloth *expenditures* should be the *cloth,* and *receipts* the garment, cut accordingly. The claim that the tariff, revised to meet the demands, has reduced the revenue and that therefore the expenditures of the Government must be curtailed—except in cases of appropriations which ought never to have been made and ought to be curtailed, irrespective of the treasury—is the surest way in the world to retard the prosperity of the country many fold the amount saved by the economy. The necessity for the conservation of our natural resources is very great. The benefit of a gigantic system of inland waterways will be inestimable. Our rivers and harbors, if treated regardless of cost, would advance immeasurably the revenues of commercial interests. Our merchant marine has languished and died as the effect of national penuriousness. Public improvements are private blessings, incalculable. Millions upon millions ought to be expended by the Government, with a free hand, and that quickly, in restoring or creating every facility for development demanded by the present and the obvious requirements of the future. The nation was never so rich or so well able to make the expenditures as to-day, and every dollar expended means many times the amount in increase of values and the prosperity of the country; and will bring ample return in the increased earning capacity of home industries. To say that because we have voluntarily reduced our present source of income we must therefore forego all this, for virtuous economy's sake, is the twaddle of the nursery, and yet it is the talk of the Senate of the United States. All because tariff revision has at last reached a limit where it must be admitted that it is no longer possible to combine protection and revenue in the same bill, and because protection is proving the stronger claim of the two.

To patch up the difference, the inheritance tax, the private income tax, an inter-state commerce tax, national economy, a budget committee, etc., are suggested; all of them vexing, uncertain, inquisitorial, discriminating, and doubtful as to results

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and, worst of all, all of them are but makeshift propositions, to temporarily support a makeshift tariff system. If the tariff system should be placed upon a perpetual, scientific basis, of universal and equitable application, the revenue therefrom would cease to be the criterion of the nation's ability to make necessary appropriations for the public welfare. It would become much like the revenue of the Post-Office, supporting the machinery of that department, with an immaterial surplus, in the case of the customs. Makeshift measures, producing a few uncertain millions, would no longer be adequate. It would necessitate and involve a practical, rational and scientific system of permanent and efficient taxation—which, like the stable tariff system, would prove a great blessing to the whole country. Such a system is not only possible but, from the distinct authority given to the Congress, in the welfare clause of the Constitution, to the conditions of to-day, and especially to the conditions which would exist under a permanent tariff for protection, everything suggests the direction of such a tax.

The necessity of a specific bond issue, for specific permanent improvements—not short-term loans, to bridge temporary deficits by another makeshift—following the general system of many of the nations of Europe, laying the greater part of the burden, of course, upon the future, which will receive the greater part of the benefit, is rational, though not upon the plan of pay-as-you-go, favored by our fathers, under very different conditions from the present—a legacy to which we cling as to a divine commission. The bond issue will some day be adopted, and will greatly relieve the heavy drain upon the present for the benefits it confers on posterity. But there will still remain the current expenses of Government which will constantly increase with the growth and prosperity of the nation, and which should be met by a permanent and efficient system of taxation. For this revenue the justice of reciprocation points to the protected industries of the country. They are the signal beneficiaries both of the sacrifice necessitated by the protective principle and of the progressive expenditures. Nor would the burden be a heavy one, even upon the pay-as-you-go policy of to-day and the present enormous revenues demanded. If every corporation and protected industry—of course excepting the retail purveyors of products to the people—were taxed upon its net income—which should be gauged by the amount

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of its dividends, the amount of its surplus and the amounts paid in salaries that are in excess of $5,000—a rate of between two and three cents on the dollar would, last year, have produced more money than the entire revenue from the customs, with the treasury deficit added. It would be the easiest possible tax to collect, the least open to fraud, the most reliable as to amount, and the tax most directly just, on principles of reciprocation. It would be a tax which would automatically increase with the growth of the country, responding at once to its increasing prosperity, thus keeping natural pace with the growing demands upon the Government. It is the only practical way to reach the dividends on the vast amount of American securities owned, or for sinister motives held abroad, and—which is really an important consideration—it would reach, effectively, without the possibility of fraud, in a very large proportion of its entire amount, the colossal fortunes which have been the objects of the income tax and inheritance tax propositions.

These various fortune-hunting tax theories which have been propounded as props to the present system, have generally carried an effort, for one reason or another, to exempt small fortunes from the tax; necessitating an inquisition, by the tax collector, into the private affairs of every citizen, for proof that his entire income did not reach four or five thousand dollars. With the proposed system the same end, if desirable, can be reached without inquisition, without the enormous expense to the Government and the eternal temptation to fraud, by the simple provision that any one holding securities subject to the tax, has but to prove, as an individual and at his own volition, that his entire income was less than the sum fixed, in order to receive from the Government a rebate of the amount which the corporation paid on his individual holding.

Such a universal tax would not only be automatic in its increase, but elastic, like the tariff; capable, any year, of a slight increase or decrease in rate, according to the demands upon the treasury; while the very conditions and nature of it, as with the tariff would place it wholly beyond autocratic, plutocratic or political chicanery; and neither the tariff nor the question of revenue could ever again disturb the stability of enterprise; forestalling the one cry which is sure to be made against the proposition, that relying upon corporations for revenue would result, in no time, in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

placing the Government at the mercy of the corporate interests, to run it as they chose. How could they do it? What could they do with it? What would be the benefit they could derive? The revenues must necessarily meet the expenditures; and the tax, established by law, could not be discriminatory. But history itself is a better reply. A very large amount of the nation's revenue, to-day, is derived from the tax on liquor and tobacco. Those interests are seldom heard from in the course of legislation; but if there are interests in America which have attempted—or to any extent succeed in the attempt—to own and manipulate the Government, it is distinctly those which have received unlimited protection, through which they have obtained enormously undue profits, without affording the Government, in return, any material reciprocation whatsoever.

On the contrary, it is much more probable that with established, universal protection, and established, universal taxation, the "Interests" becoming, themselves, practically universal, would be the strongest supporters of good government and universal justice in all matters pertaining to the progress and prosperity of the nation.

WILLARD FRENCH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE JAPANESE MERCHANT MARINE.

BY EDWIN MAXEY, PROFESSOR OF PUBLIC LAW AND DIPLOMACY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA.

AMONG the great questions of the twentieth century is, and will be, the control of the Pacific. That the question of the balance of power in Asia has assumed vastly greater importance than that of the balance of power in Europe and is the pivot about which the world politics of the twentieth century will revolve, is simply another way of saying that the Pacific will be the stage on which the drama of twentieth-century politics will be played. Notwithstanding the frequent rumors of war, it is a reasonably safe prediction that for several years the struggle for the dominance of the Pacific will be commercial, not naval; that the nation which secures the lead in the commercial struggle will have a tremendous advantage in the political and in the naval contest, if there should be one.

In the struggle for commercial supremacy, Japan is sure to be an important factor; and, so far as can be judged from the present outlook, she will be our most formidable competitor. It is also certain that means of communication will play a large part in the contest and perhaps decide its issue. Such being the case, it is fitting that we study carefully what Japan has been doing to strengthen this arm of her service. As her advance in this line has not been due to chance, but to steady, methodical efforts, it may be that we have something to learn from a study of her methods.

The Japanese Merchant Marine has had a most peculiar history—a history which illustrates many interesting truths with reference to the development of merchant navies. Among other things, it emphasizes the fact that a short-sighted legislative policy may dwarf an industry for which the country has the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

greatest natural advantage and for which its people have a natural aptitude; also that a strong national sentiment is no mean factor in furthering industrial growth, whether upon sea or upon land.

In the thirteenth century, the Japanese had, for that time, a very respectable merchant fleet. They had regular lines of large ships running to China, Annam, Siam and the Philippine Islands. They even had lines to England, Holland and other European countries. There was nothing strange in this, for the Japanese are naturally, by virtue of their geographical location, a seafaring folk. That they should become a commercial people is no more strange than that the English should, for the relative position of the two countries with reference to the adjoining continents is strikingly similar.

The strange factor in the situation is that the government should have allowed itself to be driven, under the stress of foolish impulse, to enact laws which would prohibit the people from letting their national energies find expression in a manner manifestly advantageous. But such is what happened. For, in the sixteenth century, the government, in order to effect the isolation of the country, suppressed by strong edicts all kinds of seafaring. These edicts forbade the building of ships, and even went to the fanatical extent of ordering the destruction of those already in existence. So thoroughly were these orders enforced that the Japanese merchant marine, within a short time, was practically wiped out. The progress of centuries in winning their way upon the ocean was suppressed to the degree that only in the rarest cases was there left the keel of a Japanese ship or imperial junk to plough the waters of the high seas. A policy more at variance with economic interests and national life could not well be imagined.

Yet, however disastrous this policy proved temporarily, it could not permanently root out the naval spirit of this island people. Difficult as this would be under any circumstances, it was rendered particularly so in this case by the fact that, at the time it was attempted, the means of internal communication had not been developed. To such an extent was this true, that, for communication between many parts of the same island and between one island and another, the sea was a necessity. The situation then resolved itself into this: isolation would have to be carried to the extent of cutting the country up into a great many petty states, each

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

isolated from the other as well as from the rest of the world, or else sea-traffic would have to be permitted for certain purposes. The Japanese had not so far departed from their usually practical instincts as not to choose the latter alternative.

This served as an opening wedge; for, once an active coasting-trade was developed, a long step had been taken toward the repeal of the laws interdicting foreign commerce. The final result came about in this way—the ships used in the coasting trade were owned by some of the most influential citizens of Japan; and, as there were seasons of the year when these ships would either have to be used in foreign commerce or lie idle, the pressure was too strong for the government to resist. The old navigation laws, or rather anti-navigation laws, were repealed. In a contest between mere prejudices and substantial national interests the former may be supreme for a time, but ultimately the latter must triumph or the nation become a negligible factor both in influence and achievement.

But, unfortunately, the repeal of the laws did not wipe out their evil effects. For this a considerable time was required, since the operation of those laws had naturally enough resulted in a lack of seamen. Thus the revival in the Japanese navy lagged considerably behind the legislation which made the revival possible. The zeal and effectiveness with which the Japanese went to work to overcome this handicap is one evidence of their right to a position among the first-class powers and a proof that they are a remarkable people.

To what extent the United States, acting through the expedition of Commodore Perry, is responsible for this change in Japanese national policy it is hard to say. The change might, and probably would, have come about in any case; but that it hastened the change is not open to question. Nor did our influence in this direction end with the expedition of Commodore Perry. The friendly assistance given by the United States in securing for Japan more favorable commercial treaties with the rest of the world was by no means an unimportant factor in increasing her foreign commerce, and thus furnishing an incentive for the increase of her merchant navy.

By 1879, Japan had 166 steamers with an aggregate tonnage of 42,760 tons, and 714 sailing-vessels aggregating 27,550 tons. She had by this time developed shipyards in which their sailing-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vessels were built, but the modern steamers had to be purchased abroad. As will be noticed from the number of the ships and their tonnage, the ships were still very small—the 166 steamers having almost exactly the same tonnage as the two steamers built a few years ago for the American merchant marine (the "Minnesota" and "Dakota," which have a tonnage of 21,000 each), and the combined tonnage of the 714 sailing-vessels being but five times that of the "Thomas W. Lawson," a recently built American sailing-vessel. But, small as they were, these vessels formed the nucleus about which a merchant fleet was very rapidly built up. The increasing desire for naval expansion and the increased power to expand, consequent upon the marvellous industrial awakening of the country, constituted a twofold force before which all obstacles gave way. It is significant that although up to 1890 the bulk of Japan's steamers had to be purchased abroad, mostly in England, while the sailing-vessels could be built in their own yards, the difference in expense did not prevent the Japanese merchant marine from showing about the same ratio of increase between steam and sail tonnage as the merchant marines of the other nations of the world.

The first regular line of communication between Japan and the open ports of China and Korea, since the inauguration of the new *régime,* was established in 1884-5. Now there are thirteen regular lines to China and three to Korea. Two regular lines of steamers were established between Kobe and Tsingtau, one making trips every fortnight and the other every three weeks. Between 1902 and the breaking out of the Russo-Japanese war, a regular line was operating between Tsugara and Vladivostok. Previous to this there had been Japanese lines between other parts of Japan and Vladivostok, and some idea of the rapid development of their traffic may be had from the following statistics. In 1895, there were engaged in this trade but seven Japanese ships of an aggregate tonnage of 8,420 tons, while in 1900 the number had increased to sixty-three with a tonnage of 67,273 tons—an eightfold increase, while during the same period the total tonnage engaged in the world's commerce with Vladivostok had barely trebled. That the Japanese lines between Kobe and Tsingtau are more than holding their own in competition with the German lines between these two ports is lamented by a German authority who submits the following figures: in 1902, of the shipping be-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tween these two harbors, the German lines had a tonnage of about 8,000 and the Japanese 7,500, while in 1903 the tonnage of the Japanese lines had increased to 28,145 tons and the Germans to 20,000.

By 1902, about ten per cent. of the coasting trade of Korea had passed to the Japanese merchant fleet; and, in the traffic with the harbors of Northern China, the Japanese flag covered the bulk of the commerce—in fact, it had almost exclusive control. In 1903, there went from Kobe to North China ports seven foreign steamers with an aggregate tonnage of 12,167 tons, and 137 Japanese steamers with an aggregate tonnage of 152,927 tons. During the same year, there were no foreign ships engaged in the traffic between Japan and Korea, while 103 Japanese steamers, with an aggregate tonnage of 58,753 tons, plied between the ports of the two countries. Thus the traffic between Japan and Korea had by 1903 become in effect a part of the Japanese coasting trade. Within ten years their tonnage had increased from one-half of one per cent. of the world's total tonnage to three per cent.

The growth of the Japanese merchant navy is shown by the following table taken from the report of the American Commissioner of Navigation:

Year.	Steam.		Sail.		Total.	
	Number.	Tonnage.	Number.	Net tonnage.	Number.	Steam gross and sail net.
1890	147	123,276	104	27,721	251	151,000
1891	146	120,882	98	25,602	244	146,484
1892	143	121,679	100	26,505	243	148,202
1893	179	142,095	260	37,615	439	179,710
1894	193	171,901	256	36,867	449	208,768
1895	242	274,659	255	37,655	497	312,314
1896	267	313,563	249	33,880	516	346,443
1897	318	408,503	234	31,750	552	440,253
1898	334	439,509	240	30,515	574	470,024
1899	332	455,535	310	40,966	642	496,501
1900	338	477,311	1053	117,364	1391	594,675
1901	366	518,895	1502	170,790	1862	689,683
1902	365	530,057	1497	173,480	1862	702,537
1903	373	556,036	1521	174,624	1894	730,660
1904	556	645,978	1582	184,220	2138	830,198
1905	502	843,710	1336	166,723	1838	1,010,433
1906	582	962,701	1324	166,976	1906	1,129,677

Certain of the details of the growth make it still more striking. For instance, in 1895 they had but three steam-vessels of 4,000 tons or over, having an aggregate of 14,600 tons, while in 1905 they had thirty-five vessels with an aggregate tonnage of 194,971

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tons. Thus in ten years the number of their large steamships had increased less than 1,000 and their tonnage 1,300 per cent.

It is a remarkable fact that though war is ordinarily destructive of the merchant marine of a belligerent, that of the Japanese not only did not decrease during the Russo-Japanese war, but actually showed a very material increase. During the war Japan had nine of her merchant vessels sunk by the Russian navy, six by storm and she herself sunk seventeen of them in her attempts to block Port Arthur Harbor. The aggregate tonnage of these twenty-nine vessels was 67,730 tons. To offset these losses the Japanese built five and purchased fifty-three steamers having an aggregate tonnage of 144,258 tons; and captured twenty-eight steamers, of which five were released and the remaining twenty-three condemned by prize courts for carrying contraband or attempting to run the blockade. While there is no official statement available of the tonnage of these vessels, conservative estimates place it at not less than 73,000 tons. The increase in the Japanese merchant navy during the first year of the war was, therefore, fifty-two vessels, having a tonnage of not less than 180,000 tons or more than eighty per cent. greater than during the preceding year.

The increase in the efficiency of her merchant fleet during the war was even greater than would appear from the increase in tonnage, and for this reason: the vessels captured by the Japanese were nearly all fine steamers, whereas the seventeen vessels sunk by the Japanese in attempting to block Port Arthur were, naturally, the oldest and poorest in her fleet, so that the loss of those 35,208 tons did not mean a proportionate loss in the efficiency or value of the fleet.

The attitude of the Japanese Government toward the growth of her merchant marine has changed from an attitude of hostility, which continued up to less than a century ago, to one of co-operation. Though the history of the change in the attitude of the Government is brief, it is, nevertheless, interesting. The active assistance given by the Government may properly be said to have been called into existence by the Chino-Japanese war. On March 25th, 1896, two laws which mark an epoch in the history of Japanese legislation in behalf of their merchant marine were passed. They affected vitally the development of the merchant navy and its relation to the state. One was for the purpose of encouraging ship-building, the other to encourage the owning

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and operating of regular steamship lines. The first of these provided that steel and iron ships of not less than seven hundred and not more than one thousand registered tons, built according to the rules and under the supervision of the Minister of Public Ways, either by Japanese individuals or by a company formed exclusively of Japanese, shall be paid twelve yen (six dollars) for each ton; and that every ship of this kind having a registered tonnage greater than one thousand tons shall draw from the Imperial treasury twenty yen for each ton and five yen additional for each horse-power. In the building of these ships only such material may be used as is permitted by the Ministry of Public Ways.

According to the second law, each steel or iron ship of one thousand registered tons or more, owned exclusively by Japanese, carrying the Japanese flag and sailing between Japan and a foreign country, or between the ports of foreign countries, is entitled to a subsidy. In the year 1902 the following subsidies or subventions were paid under the declaration of the Ministry of Marine: a post subsidy of $3,091,981, or considerably more than the very liberal post subsidy of the German Empire, which for the same year was $2,131,385; a premium of $351,461 to encourage shipping; and a ship-building premium of $138,570. These are considerable amounts for a small country of limited resources to pay; yet such is the national sentiment in favor of a strong merchant fleet that the money is voted and paid without complaint.

Though the origin of this sentiment in favor of power on the sea dates back farther than the Chino-Japanese war, it did not until then reach the proportions of a full-grown conviction. The events of that war, together with the events immediately following it, made it abundantly clear to the Japanese that to be a first-class Power they must be a strong Power on the sea. They were also convinced that a navy to be permanently strong must have as a foundation a strong merchant marine. The practical and determined way in which they set about having both, and the success they have achieved are worthy of study and admiration.

The Russo-Japanese war certainly did not weaken their convictions as to the importance of sea power. We may, therefore, rest assured of the fact that in the future the Japanese merchant marine will be an important factor to be reckoned with in the commercial world, as will the Japanese navy in the political and military world.

EDWIN MAXEY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE UNITED STATES COURTS.

BY ORIN JUDSON FIELD, CHIEF CLERK DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

THAT a rapidly increasing amount of litigation of national importance is becoming the subject-matter of suits in the Federal courts; that earnest and successful efforts are being made to enforce our national laws, particularly those of recent enactment, such as the Pure Food and Drugs Act, the Safety Appliance Act, the Anti-trust and Interstate Commerce Laws; and that the Government is watchful of the commercial interests of its citizens through the operations of the Federal Bankruptcy Law of 1898 is shown by recent official statistics, which disclose that, during the year ended June 30th, 1908, there were 28,250 suits and prosecutions commenced in the United States courts and 16,838 petitions in bankruptcy filed. The aggregate judgments obtained and fines imposed amounted to $55,178,016. In bankruptcy cases the total liabilities were $122,621,509, while the assets realized were only $23,066,085.

Pure Food and Meat Inspection Laws.—During the fiscal year referred to, sixty-one criminal prosecutions and sixty-five civil cases were instituted for violations of the Pure Food and Meat Inspection laws, the aggregate amount of fines imposed and judgments obtained being $18,715. The administration of both the Pure Food and the Meat Inspection laws is under the Department of Agriculture, which maintains a system of rigid inspection; and as violations are discovered, they are reported to the district attorney for prosecution. In view of the statement that the American people consume 15,000,000,000 pounds of meat annually, the importance of the enforcement of the Meat Inspection law can be readily realized.

The cases so far brought under the Pure Food and Drugs Act

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of June 30th, 1906, have involved the misbranding and adulterating of articles of food or drugs. Several prosecutions were brought for misbranding eggs—that is, labelling them "strictly fresh," while an official examination disclosed the contrary to be the case. Other cases involved the misbranding of distilled water artificially lithiated as natural mineral or lithia spring water.

By far the most interesting and important questions as yet arising under the Pure Food Law are those involving the branding of different kinds of spirits, claimed by their manufacturers to be entitled to the name "Whiskey," with or without qualifying words. The real question at issue is, "What is Whiskey?" Under what circumstances may a distilled spirit be branded "Whiskey" without qualifying words? Under what circumstances should a liquid be marked "Straight Whiskey," "Compounded Whiskey," "Blended Whiskey" or "Imitation Whiskey"? Within the meaning of the Pure Food Law, what is a "blend" and what is a "compound"? Is a mixture of whiskey with neutral spirit or ethyl alcohol a "compound" or a "blend"?

After being considered at some length by different Departments and no satisfactory conclusion being reached, the leading distillers and rectifiers of the country laid the matter before President Taft, with the result that he referred to the Solicitor-General of the Department of Justice, for investigation, the general question of the right to the name "Whiskey."

Lengthy and hotly contested hearings were held, all of the leading distillers and rectifiers of the country being represented, and the report of the Solicitor-General, recently rendered, is the latest chapter in the long story of the fight over the correct definition of whiskey under the Pure Food Law.

According to this report whiskey is not whiskey unless it is made from grain, and a mixture of an admitted whiskey with alcohol or neutral spirits is entitled to the name whiskey, provided the mixture retains a substantial amount of by-products in proportion to the volume of the mixture, giving distinctive flavor and properties, while all so-called whiskeys made from potatoes, molasses and other substances are not whiskeys at all.

The question, however, is one which in all probability will ultimately have to be determined by the courts.

Banking Laws.—Under the National Bank Laws, there were 137 cases pending at the beginning of the year. During the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

year seventy-two additional indictments were secured, making a total of 209. Of these eighty-nine were terminated during the year, resulting in thirty-five convictions and nineteen acquittals, while in thirty-five cases the indictments were discontinued. There were twenty pleas of guilty and thirty trials by jury. These prosecutions involved presidents, vice-presidents and cashiers of national banks, as well as tellers and bookkeepers, indicted for embezzlement or misapplication of bank funds, making false entries, reports, etc.

Postal Laws.—No less than 1,901 cases were brought for violations of the Postal Laws, and the fines imposed and judgments obtained amounted to $241,651. These cases involved prosecutions for fraudulent use of the mails, robbing post-offices and suits on postmasters' bonds.

Twenty-eight-hour Law.—By the act of June 29th, 1906, it is unlawful for railroads, express companies or steam or sailing vessels carrying or transporting cattle, sheep, swine or other animals from one State into or through another State, to confine the same in cars, boats or vessels for a period longer than twenty-eight consecutive hours without unloading the same into properly equipped pens for rest, water and feeding for a period of at least five consecutive hours.

For violations of this act 490 suits were instituted during the year, and of the 375 terminated judgments for the United States were obtained in 283 cases. The aggregate fines imposed amounted to $71,282.

Several important questions were raised in the course of this litigation:

1. What is the unit of violation? A suit was instituted against the Baltimore & Ohio Southwestern Railroad Company, in the Southern District of Ohio, involving eleven shipments of live-stock, all of which were carried in one train. The railroad company raised the question that, inasmuch as all of these eleven shipments were in one train, there could be only one violation of the law instead of eleven; otherwise stated, that the unit of violation was the train-load and not the separate shipments contained in said train-load. The trial court sustained this contention and imposed only one penalty on the railroad. The United States took the case to the Circuit Court of Appeals, where the case was reversed, that Court holding that the unit of violation

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was each shipment and not the train-load. The railroad filed a petition for a rehearing on the ground that the action was criminal in its nature, and therefore the Government could not appeal. This petition was denied by the Circuit Court of Appeals, and the railroad company has taken the case to the Supreme Court of the United States on a writ of error.

2. Are stock-yards railroads? Another question that has been vigorously contested is whether stock-yard companies who operate a few miles of railroad track, running from their yards and pens to trunk lines of railroads, are "railroads" under the terms of the act.

In a number of cases in Illinois, the trial court held that the St. Louis National Stock Yards Company is not a railroad within the meaning of this act. In these cases, the stock was consigned to commission firms at the St. Louis National Stock Yards, and the only means of reaching their destination was by having these cars transported over the railroad tracks owned by the St. Louis National Stock Yards Company. They were so transported by engines owned by the stock-yards and by the employees of the company. In this and similar cases no way bills were issued by the regular railroad companies for this part of the haul; neither did the stock-yards company participate in any of the freight charges for transporting the stock. The stock-yards company was paid so much per car by the regular railroad company, and it was contended that this was a switching service only. These cases were taken by the Government to the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, where they are now pending.

3. What is the proper equipment of pens? In the eastern district of Arkansas, in a case against the St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railroad for failure to unload the live-stock into properly equipped pens, it was shown that the stock-yards contained no pens; that the stock was fed by throwing the food on the ground. The court held that there was no violation of the law and dismissed the case. It was taken to the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit by the Government, where it is now pending.

In a number of other cases penalties have been inflicted for failure properly to equip pens, without any particular contention being raised on this provision of the law and without any appeal from the decisions.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Internal Revenue and Customs Laws.—The reports show that during the year there were 4,116 criminal prosecutions and 801 civil cases instituted for violations of the Internal Revenue and Customs laws, and the total amount of fines imposed and judgments obtained in these cases was $607,835.

New York, being the principal port of entry, naturally had the largest number of Customs cases, 435.

The Southern States, where "moonshining" or illicit distilling prevails, show the greatest number of violations of the Internal Revenue Laws, namely: Mississippi, 661; North Carolina, 436; Tennessee, 417; Kentucky, 409; and Georgia, 398.

Anti-trust and Interstate Commerce Laws.—Litigation arising under the Anti-trust Laws and the Interstate Commerce Acts is attracting unusual attention, and the enforcement of these laws has become an important factor in our economic and political affairs.

For violations of these acts there were instituted during the year 109 cases; and of the sixty-four terminated convictions were had in fifty-four cases, the aggregate amount of fines imposed and judgments obtained amounting to $29,964,921. This amount includes the fine of $29,240,000 against the Standard Oil Company. As is well known, the judgment in this case was reversed by the Circuit Court of Appeals, and it was taken to the Supreme Court of the United States on a writ of *certiorari*. The Supreme Court denied the petition, and a new trial was then commenced in the United States District Court at Chicago, with the result that a verdict was directed for the Standard Oil Company on the ground that an established rate binding upon the shipper in a criminal proceeding cannot be shown by a tariff based upon a classification which has been revised since the issuing of the tariff, even though such revision was duly published and filed.

Among the more recent cases of interest under the Sherman Anti-trust law were suits against the so-called School Furniture Trust, the Tobacco Trust, the Powder Trust, the Fertilizer Trust, the Umbrella Trust, the Drug Trust, the Plumbers' Supply Trust and the Turpentine Trust.

Since the enactment of the Anti-trust laws, 64 cases have been brought, as follows: Harrison's administration, 7; Cleveland's second administration, 8; McKinley's administration, 3; Roose-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

velt's administration, 46. There have been 11 convictions and 16 injunctions granted, while 22 cases are still pending. The total fines imposed have amounted to $147,000.

Under the Interstate Commerce acts and the Elkins Act of 1903, many suits have been brought against railroad companies and others for granting or receiving rebates, discrimination in the distribution of cars, false billing, and suits to enforce orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission as follows: Cleveland's first administration, 1; Harrison's administration, 35; Cleveland's second administration, 19; McKinley's administration, 22; Roosevelt's administration, 189; in all, 265 cases, resulting in 70 convictions, while 88 cases are still pending. The total fines imposed have amounted to $30,369,351.

Safety-Appliance Act.—Railroad employees are vitally concerned in the enforcement of this act, which requires railroads to equip their cars with automatic couplers and continuous brakes. For violations of this act there were, during the year, 283 cases instituted; and of the 159 cases terminated, judgments for the United States were obtained in 139 cases, the fines imposed amounting to $53,203. In only 4 cases were the judgments against the United States; 16 cases were dismissed and 18 were appealed to the Circuit Court of Appeals.

Land Laws.—For violations of the Land and Timber Trespass laws, there were 249 criminal prosecutions and 302 civil cases instituted, the fines and judgments amounting to $150,083. There are now pending before the courts over 900 cases for violations of the land laws, such as making false entries, illegal fencing of public land and cutting timber on Government land. Through these suits millions of acres are being restored to the public domain and damages recovered for timber illegally cut on Government land.

Bankruptcy.—A study of the operations of the act of July 1st, 1898, establishing a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States is very interesting. During the year there were 16,838 petitions in bankruptcy filed, as compared with 14,160 for the preceding year. The States showing the largest number of cases filed during the year are as follows: New York, 2,210; Alabama, 1,554; Illinois, 1,380; Massachusetts, 1,223; and Pennsylvania, 1,112.

The States and Territories showing the smallest number of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

petitions filed during the year are the following: Nevada, 27; Delaware, 17; Arizona, 15; Porto Rico, 9; Wyoming, 4.

The total net assets realized in the 11,879 cases closed during the year were $23,066,085, while the liabilities involved therein were $122,621,509. In 4,122 cases there were no assets, while in 3,885 cases the assets were less than $500.

The total dividends paid during the year were $13,959,873, while the fees and expenses incident to the prosecution of cases under the bankruptcy law were $3,881,691.

The reports indicate as follows the nature of business of those who went into bankruptcy, compared with the preceding year:

	1907.	1908.
Farmers	1,065	835
Wage-earners	3,387	3,512
Merchants	4,517	4,213
Manufacturers	935	617
Professional	272	252
Miscellaneous	2,026	2,460
Pauper cases	674	762

Organization.—The United States is divided into nine judicial circuits and eighty-five judicial districts, presided over by twenty-nine Circuit judges and eighty-eight District judges who are appointed for life, and thirty-five Territorial judges appointed for terms of four years each. A Circuit judge receives an annual salary of $7,000 and a District judge $6,000. Court, however, is held in several places in each district, and a District judge must pay his own travelling and hotel expenses when absent from his home. The Government is represented in each District by a district attorney, who is appointed by the President for a term of four years.

The total expense of administering the affairs of the United States courts during the year was $8,400,000.

Results.—The aggregate amount and results of the litigation in the United States courts during the last year are shown by the accompanying table:

CIVIL CASES TO WHICH THE UNITED STATES WAS A PARTY.

Number commenced during the year	3,202
Number terminated during the same period	2,483
Number of judgments for United States	1,410
Number appealed to Circuit Court of Appeals	197
Number appealed to Supreme Court of United States	25
Aggregate amount of judgments for the United States	$771,381

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CRIMINAL PROSECUTIONS TO WHICH THE UNITED STATES WAS A PARTY.

Number commenced during the year	13,345
Number terminated during the same period	12,942
Number of convictions	8,412
Number of acquittals	1,434
Number of pleas of guilty	4,369
Number of trials by jury	2,631
Aggregate amount of fines, forfeitures and penalties imposed	$30,594,280

SUITS TO WHICH THE UNITED STATES WAS NOT A PARTY.

Number commenced during the year	11,703
Number terminated during the same period	9,128
Number of judgments for plaintiffs	3,195
Number of judgments for defendants	1,252
Number dismissed or discontinued	4,681
Amount of judgments for plaintiffs	$22,842,597
Amount of judgments for defendants	969,758

BANKRUPTCY.

Number of petitions filed during the year	16,838
Number of cases closed during the year	11,879
Total liabilities of cases closed	$122,621,509
Total net assets realized	23,066,085
Total dividends paid	13,959,873
Total fees and expenses	3,881,691
Number of petitions filed since the passage of the Bankruptcy Act in 1898	179,167

It will thus be seen that our Federal judiciary—one of the co-ordinate branches of the national Government—is charged with a grave and important work in passing judgment upon the thousands of cases coming before them each year, and, in many cases, in laying down entirely new principles of law and applying old principles to new and ever-changing conditions.

How greatly does our national security and prosperity, and the maintenance of our legal and civic rights, depend upon the zealous prosecution and the vigorous and impartial enforcement of the statutes enacted by Congress for our common welfare!

ORIN JUDSON FIELD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FOREIGN INVESTMENTS OF THE NATIONS

BY CHARLES F. SPEARE.

EVERY nation that plays any sort of part in the world's business affairs is an investor in every other nation whether as a purchaser of government bonds, as a buyer of the securities of foreign railroads and industrial concerns, or, it may be, as a capitalist placing funds in the various lucrative fields of commerce and banking. It is said that trade follows the flag. There are earnest disputants of this argument. It is a well-established fact, however, that the foreign commerce of most countries expands or contracts in sympathy with the amount of capital that they have located in other lands, where markets are being opened and new commercial requirements are constantly revealed.

This is the day of extravagance and excess in expenditures among individuals, and also with governments, municipalities, States and corporations. Budgets everywhere are hard to balance; increased taxation has not solved the problem of the national deficit. But, in spite of these tremendous outlays, the universal wealth of resource and the inventive genius and productive capacity of the individual provide a very great surplus over outgo in the chief wealth-creating countries of the world. It has been estimated that every year, in Europe and in the United States, the saving for investment in newly manufactured or old-established securities amounts to $2,500,000,000. The nations with a surplus to invest, either at home or abroad, in their rank are: United States, $600,000,000; Great Britain, $450,000,000; France, $400,000,000; Germany, $300,000,000; Holland, Belgium and Switzerland, $250,000,000; Austria-Hungary, $160,000,000; Russia, $160,000,000; Italy, $60,000,000; Spain and Portugal, $60,000,000; and Norway and Sweden, $40,000,000.

From figures I have compiled and which appear in detail

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

further along in this article, I should say that the total foreign investments of the surplus-investing countries of the world aggregate between $26,000,000,000 and $29,000,000,000. As the world's negotiable securities, according to M. Alfred Neymarck were, in 1907, approximately $111,000,000,000, it will be seen that over 25 per cent. of the investments of different nations is in bonds and stocks of the *outre-mer* class.

In the trade of countries reciprocity of investments or, let us say, internationalism of securities, is steadily becoming an intimate factor making for commercial favoritism. As a rule, the nation with the greatest volume of exports is that one whose surplus wealth has judiciously been distributed where population is on the increase and purchasing power is growing. Great Britain was the pioneer in this line. Her numerous colonies gave her a broad market for manufactures and a fairly safe one in which to locate the idle funds of her people. Now she draws an annual income of $500,000,000 from $14,000,000,000 of investments abroad. Germany, soon after the close of the Franco-Prussian war, began to colonize and to invest systematically in foreign countries, employing the $1,000,000,000 indemnity from France as the base of capital supply. She has carried this policy further than any other nation and has, indeed, been a trifle reckless in liberal placements of capital in remote corners of the earth. German investments abroad are estimated at about $5,000,000,000. With France the governing idea of large foreign investments has not been a trade *quid pro quo,* but the distribution of her wealth so as to minimize the risk on the original investment. The desire to escape the growing tax bill on home securities, as well as to offset the possible danger to invested capital of the spread of Socialism in France, has also prompted French policies. France saves so much more rapidly than she spends, and her trade and new enterprise fluctuate so little that it is necessary she should have a foreign outlet for her surplus. French investments in other countries are about $7,000,000,000. In comparison with its wealth the United States has made very sparing investments abroad. The explanation of this is that it has paid the American better to place his capital in home enterprises than to turn it into foreign channels. Moreover, the rate of industrial development in this country has been so rapid that there has been little to spare for other nations, while hundreds

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of millions were annually tendered the promoters of new domestic promotions. The foreign investments made in behalf of the United States have gone into Mexico, South America, the West Indies and the Philippines. Their value may be conservatively estimated at between $1,750,000,000 and $2,000,000,000. The outside investments of Holland will reach about $1,000,000,000; those of Belgium, $500,000,000; of Switzerland, $350,000,000; and of Austria-Hungary, $250,000,000. In recent years, Canada has become an investor on quite a large scale in Mexico and in Cuba, and contrary to what seemed possible a decade ago, Canadian capital has come over the border and played a part, even though a very small one, in encouraging commercial development in the United States. As late as 1900, Canada had not sufficient capital to develop her mines, her farms, forests and railroads. It was American and British enterprise that extracted the first dividends from the Dominion. Now Canada is one of the richest of the British colonies and each year has a surplus for investment abroad, although the opportunities for large yields on capital are better in native than in foreign enterprises.

It is possible with considerable accuracy to show just how the foreign investments of the United States, Great Britain, France and less definitely Germany have been placed, for a very careful study of this subject has been made in Europe by M. Alfred Neymarck, M. Arthur Raffalovich, Paul Dehn and George Paish of the London "Statist," while in this country we are indebted to the consular service and the Bureau of South-American Republics for a great deal of information available:

AMERICAN INVESTMENTS ABROAD.

Mexico	$600,000,000 to $700,000,000
Cuba and Porto Rico	130,000,000
South America	100,000,000
Central America	50,000,000
Canada	500,000,000
Europe	350,000,000
China and Japan	100,000,000
Philippine Islands	75,000,000

The distribution of the British investment in other countries is:

BRITISH INVESTMENTS ABROAD.

United States and Canada	$5,850,000,000
Africa	2,675,000,000
Asia	2,255,000,000
Australia	1,735,000,000
Europe (Continental)	1,025,000,000
South America	750,000,000

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The French foreign placements of capital are vast and widely distributed, as the following table shows:

FRENCH INVESTMENTS ABROAD.

Russia	$1,750,000,000
Egypt and Suez	600,000,000
Spain and Cuba	500,000,000
Austria-Hungary	600,000,000
Turkey	450,000,000
Argentina, Brazil and Mexico	500,000,000
Italy	400,000,000
England and Colonies	250,000,000
Portugal	200,000,000
United States and Canada	350,000,000
Belgium, Holland and Switzerland	225,000,000
South Africa	200,000,000
China and Japan	150,000,000
Germany	100,000,000
Sweden, Norway and Denmark	100,000,000
Other states	700,000,000

GERMAN INVESTMENTS ABROAD.

South America	$750,000,000
United States and Canada	750,000,000
Africa	350,000,000
Central America, Mexico and West Indies	200,000,000
Austria-Hungary	500,000,000
Italy	150,000,000
China and Japan	150,000,000
Russia	1,000,000,000

In examining not only the geographical distribution, but the character of the foreign investments of these four countries, one is impressed by the varying policies actuating the American investor in contrast with those of the Britisher, and also the Frenchman's point of view of a good and safe investment and the German's. The French and the British are the most scientific of investors. They have been placing their surplus capital in foreign lands for generations. They go about the business much as they would conduct their professional labors. While both have been guilty of grave investment indiscretions, losing enormous sums in South-African gold-mines, they have, for the total amount placed abroad, more to show, at current market quotations, than any other nations. The Frenchman prefers government bonds with a fixed revenue. These form the greater part of his investments. M. Alfred Neymarck, who has studied the "*petit epargne*" of France more closely than any other one man, finds in a study of French investments great psychological as well as financial value, as it shows most accurately the temperament of the people. Of the $27,000,000,000 of divers securities quoted

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on the Paris Bourse and the exchanges of the departments $18,000,000,000 represents bonds and stocks of a fixed rate of interest. The greater part of this vast amount is located in the choicest of securities. In Great Britain, of $25,000,000,000 of various issues belonging to the English people, from $16,000,000,000 to $18,000,000,000 worth are in securities whose rate of income fluctuates. This is also true of Germany, where the obligation with a variable rate is most conspicuous in the portfolio of the investor. In the United States, the value of American securities in public hands is placed at $36,000,000,000. This is divided between $22,000,000,000 stocks and $14,000,000,000 bonds. Summarized, France has 75 per cent. of her investment in fixed income-bearing securities; Great Britain, 35 per cent.; Germany, 25 per cent.; and the United States, 38 per cent. Inversely, the proportion in fluctuating income attracting American capital is 62 per cent.; of Germany, 75 per cent.; British, 65 per cent.; and of French capital only 25 per cent. We can realize from these facts how completely the advice of one of the French finance ministers of two centuries ago has been accepted by his compatriots. The admonition was: "If you would sleep well buy governments; if you would live well buy industrials." The Frenchman and, to a lesser degree, the Englishman are looking for safety of income; the German and the American seek after large returns in income and in appreciation of market value, both of which involve a considerable element of risk to principal.

It has been said that, in the last half-century, Great Britain has invested abroad nearly as much as all of the other leading countries combined. It is this enormous investment that has given London pre-eminence as the leading money-market of the world. George Paish reckons that, between 1884 and 1891, British investments in the colonies and in countries outside English jurisdiction took $2,150,000,000 of British capital. From 1897 to 1904 foreign investments of Great Britain were only about $500,000,000. In that period the demands at home were so heavy that there was not very much of a surplus available for other countries. In general, the trend of British capital is toward foreign markets, as the need of it to develop her own immediate resources is becoming smaller every year, with the population nearly stationary and the maximum of accomplishment about reached by her railroads and factories. In 1907 an income

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tax was paid on $330,000,000. This compares with an income twenty years ago of $195,000,000.

British capital has been one of the most important factors in the development of the United States. But for it many of the railroads which are now paying dividends could never have been projected and as many more, which were wrecked, could not have been rehabilitated. To-day British capital is doing for Canada what it did for the United States. The money for new railroad construction in the Dominion comes from London. So does that for land development and the improvement of municipalities. The British gold sovereign is the fulcrum underneath the progress of Argentina, China, Brazil and Sweden. The British investor cuts his coupons from the bonds of twoscore governments. The political *entente* with Russia since the war has served to draw British funds into the Empire of Nicholas and bring about a renaissance in the industries of Siberia, Central Asia and the Caucasus. The Englishman finances his colonies most generously. Consequently, the home government must always guard its subjects in the seven seas against any calamities that would react unfavorably on the enormous money interests at stake.

When the American decides to invest his capital abroad he makes a compromise with his natural prejudice and tries to keep his capital as near home as possible. This accounts for the predominance of American money in Mexico. There is not a mining camp in the Republic to the south of us but has drawn on American capital. The City of Mexico is rapidly becoming Americanized. The money invested in Mexican mines is double that located in all other enterprises. In the past ten years American money has been flowing into Mexico at the rate of from $50,000,000 to $75,000,000 per annum. In 1906 Minister-of-Finance Limantour estimated that, of the total investment of $200,000,000 of foreign capital in Mexico that year American money figured for $125,000,000. He agrees that our aggregate investments in the Republic are close to three-quarters of a billion dollars. It is expected that, in the future, Mexico will draw on the United States in greater ratio for capital for banks, railroads, irrigation projects and strictly mercantile enterprises, as there has been a feeling that too large a part of American investment in Mexico is in one class of industry, viz., mining.

Of the $125,000,000 of American capital invested in Cuba the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

greater part is in sugar and tobacco plantations, in the bonds of the Republic and in the banks and railroads. The largest banking institutions in Havana are supported by American capital. The $35,000,000 Cuban loan of a few years ago was largely placed in the United States, and what went abroad is steadily coming back here. American capital controls the telegraph and telephone systems of Cuba. Practically all of the electric transportation on the island has resulted from American enterprise and American dollars. The two main railroad systems in Cuba embrace a $25,000,000 investment from capitalists in this country. Sugar, tobacco and cattle absorb many millions more. In Porto Rico from $10,000,000 to $15,000,000 has been invested since the war in fruit and sugar plantations. The investments in the Philippines of $75,000,000 are mainly in steam roads, electric lines and light and power concerns and in government obligations.

The strongest appeal for American capital comes from the Latin countries south of the Gulf of Mexico. It has not been ignored. Although Europe holds one billion dollars of the debts of South-American republics, the United States is taking her place well up toward the top of the nations who are financing that country. Ultimately she ought to have first rank, as she is in the best position to secure trade and to watch over her investments. The visit of Secretary Root to South America marked an epoch in the financial relations between the peoples of the northern and southern hemispheres. It was followed by heavy American investments in Brazil. In Rio de Janeiro and Sao Paulo telephone, tramway, electric light and power concessions valued at $25,000,000 were secured. American investments in Brazil are now so large that there is a demand there for an American bank to compete with those which English, German and Italian enterprise has established. Two of the most important banking-houses of New York are behind the $25,000,000 railroad project in which the Government of Bolivia is concerned. Two large banking firms in New York have supplied capital for a $12,000,000 nitrate development scheme in Chile and still another has $15,000,000 in Brazilian coffee valorization. American capital to the extent of $10,000,000 is represented in the construction of a Peruvian railroad. Argentina has $10,000,000 of American money, Ecuador, $10,000,000; Colombia, $5,000,000; the Domin-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ican Republic, $15,000,000; and in Central America the American investment is reckoned at $50,000,000, of which the larger part is in Costa Rica. The dollar of the Yankee is being used to exploit the Congo; it is found in so remote a region as Norway, where an $11,000,000 ore company has progressed through American funds. Without American capital Japan could not have so successfully carried on her war with Russia. Now that China is awakening, American capital has as good a chance as any of recognition in the Chinese Empire. In Canada, American investments have been placed as high as $500,000,000. American capital, in fact, gave Canada her start and played the largest part in transforming the Dominion industrially, so that now she, too, has a place among the lenders of capital to outside nations.

France has assumed leadership in the outside world as a lender. She is a guardian of public debts. The influence of the franc is strongest in government circles. For this reason France to-day exercises more of a balancing power in the political affairs of Europe than does any other country. France holds $1,600,000,000 of Russian government bonds, but her investments in Russian industrial enterprise is less than $150,000,000. A similar disproportion exists between the enormous ownership of bonds of Austria, Roumania, Servia, Turkey and Greece and the investment in the privately owned companies of these states. Brazil, Canada, Mexico and Japan have all, in recent years, opened channels into which some of the French savings are expected to flow to quicken the development of industry in those countries. It was reported a short time ago that the French clergy, on account of the hostile attitude of the home government, would withdraw their investments from France and distribute them in other countries and that they had subscribed $10,000,000 to a new bank in Mexico.

There is scarcely a civilized country over which the sun sets that has not felt, in the past thirty years, the leavening effect of German capital. A study of German investments abroad is an index to German political and commercial ambitions. German investments are certainly cosmopolitan. The bills drawn by the three great Berlin banks are becoming almost as familiar in different parts of the world as those which originate around the Bank of England. Germany is a pioneer in the trade world, and even though her financial influence is spread very thin in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

places, there is a universality about it that is attractive and compels admiration.

German capital has fought its way into the undeveloped corners of the globe and earned dividends in the most unpromising fields. There is a record of 4,000 German houses carrying on trade in foreign parts. The German colonizer with a good bank credit at his back has worked his way into the forbidding but fruitful parts of South Africa and set up his shop for barter among uncivilized and savage people. He has penetrated the forests and jungles of South America and is the best known of the foreigners along the Amazon. After him has come the agent of the German bank and the exporter and importer, so that by the time capitalists of other countries began to appreciate the profit of these foreign parts the German had rounded out his establishment and was in fair control of the business. German capital is to be found in places so remote that the average American would not recognize the name or identify the location and never realize that trade possibilities were there. No country's trade is too small for Germany to consider if the potential element of increase exists. When England first began to think of investments in Asia Minor, she found that German capitalists had already invested $50,000,000 there in very remunerative enterprises and were getting much more from the investment in trade returns than France, whose ownership of Turkish securities was double that amount. Spanish, Portuguese and Italian trade are dominated by the German. One German bank has twenty-three overseas branches, and if its supernumeraries in the various countries were brought together they would represent a curious medley of tongues and shades of color. German capital is rapidly working eastward from Persia and spreading all over the undeveloped portions of China. The race for possession of the commercially strategic points in China is between German and English capital. The plans under way for the economic unfolding of the Chinese Empire involve very heavy outlays of foreign funds within and without the limits of the great Chinese wall, and this the reign of a new dynasty may accelerate.

Has Germany used her surplus capital too freely abroad, and will she be forced to limit her scheme of foreign markets? This question has a leading place to-day in German financial discussion, and it would seem as though less oversea activity were likely.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dutch capital abroad is mainly located in Russia, the United States, Austria-Hungary and Peru. The amount of it is about $550,000,000. Of this about 50 per cent. is invested in the United States and 30 per cent. in Russia.

Let us return to the question of how investments in foreign countries influence the oversea's trade of a nation. The export business of Great Britain in 1907 was nearly 50 per cent. greater than in 1903. This gain is believed by English economists to be directly due to the large increase in investments made by British people in foreign countries. Trade with the English colonies, in particular, has expanded freely. Nor is it to be wondered at when it is realized that two years ago $250,000,000 of British money was sent to them. For 1908 the amount has increased to $350,000,000. Germany, next to Great Britain, has benefited by this interplay of foreign investments with trade balances. Not only has she added very greatly to her exports, but she has created most advantageous markets abroad from which she draws an abundance of raw material for import, at favorable prices, and for subsequent manufacture into finished product. The same tendencies are to be noted wherever American capital has found a location abroad. They are especially prominent in the Latin-American countries whose trade with the United States last year aggregated $600,000,000 as against $234,000,000 ten years before. In this decade imports from Mexico, South and Central America more than doubled while exports trebled. Owing to the large investments of American capital in Mexico nearly 50 per cent. of the annual purchases of the Republic are made in the United States or three times those of England or Germany and five times greater than France, all of whom are considerable investors in Mexico. South-Americans especially have come to demand that nations to successfully compete for their trade should show a fair amount of liberality in using their surplus capital for the development of private and public enterprises, such as street railroads, water-works, electric light and water plants, terminals and railroads. The ship-loads of machinery entering South-American ports originate largely in England and in Germany. It is from those countries that the capital to create new enterprise in the tropics has been chiefly obtained.

It will be years, probably, before the United States plays a leading rôle as banker for the world. There is too much for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the American capitalist and merchant to do here at home to permit of investigation of foreign fields. It is exasperating, however, to see how lightly foreign trade is regarded in the United States and the loose methods that have been adopted in cultivating it. What we export other countries are compelled to buy from us. An exceedingly small percentage of our European trade reflects careful study of how to win and hold the foreign buyer. We are wasting our opportunities in this respect and are heedless of the future, just as we are exhausting at a rapid rate our material resources. No country could have greater opportunity for an extension of its foreign trade than America, for no country has the opportunity which tremendous immigration from all parts of Europe gives for advertisement of our products to the consuming world. Commerce follows capital and it also follows the immigrant. The increase from $40,000,000 to $100,000,000 in American foreign trade with Italy in ten years obviously represents a return on the human capital which we had borrowed. The same is true of the 50 per cent. increase in exports from the United States to Russia since 1897, and the 135 per cent. expansion in American shipments of produce and merchandise to Germany subsequent to the 1893 panic. The immigrant sees in our markets what his people at home would like to buy and recommends the purchase. Our manufacturers should appreciate better than they do their advantage in learning from the aliens what foreign markets require and in what way these requirements should be met to be attractive.

One aspect of this international investment of capital bears on the political side of it. The effect of American capital in the Latin-American countries is certainly powerful for peace. France could almost dictate, if she wished, the political policies of half a dozen European countries the bulk of whose debt she holds. It is most certain that, in the recent flare-up in the Near East, the balance of power was in Paris simply because French capital demanded peace as the *quid pro quo* of its relief of the belligerent states in times of financial stress. The internationalization of capital, if it continues at the present rate, may be more effective for peace than large navies and standing armies. Already it wields a power which the conferences at The Hague and the *ententes* between the monarchs of Europe have not been able to produce.

CHARLES F. SPEARE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE FORTIFYING PRINCIPLE IN SWINBURNE.

BY LOUISE COLLIER WILLCOX.

To one entirely uninitiated, reading the notices which have appeared since the death of the last poet of the greater Victorian tradition, it might appear merely that a great metrical artist had died or that we had lost a somewhat morbid and erratic poet who, in the days of his youth, gave sundry shocks to the British Philistine. The youth of the great poet just dead was, indeed, not lacking in the indiscretions which are the outcome of untested courage, untried convictions and young, exuberant genius. In the year 1862, an almost unknown poet, named Algernon Charles Swinburne, published in "The Spectator" for May 31st a poem, undoubtedly astonishing to the unaccustomed English audience, called "Faustine," but a clue was given to its order and derivation in an article from the same hand, on September 6th, on Charles Baudelaire's "*Fleurs du Mal.*" Indeed, a conscientious perusal of Baudelaire's volume of 1857, Gautier's of 1850, the poems published by de Musset between 1836 and 1850 and by Victor Hugo from 1820 onwards, would go far toward accounting for what was amazing and shocking to English readers in Mr. Swinburne's first series of "Poems and Ballads," published in 1866 when the author was still short of his thirtieth birthday. Never before, it was said, had a volume of poetry, on its first appearance, so taken the universities by storm. It was not a *succés populaire* even then; but young Oxford and Cambridge were set afire by the new and haunting rhythms, the alien and entrancing settings, the unfamiliar themes. The models, indeed, were not so far to seek, and what might not be gathered from French sources could be traced to the more familiar wells of Greek poetry, or to Hebraic influences as in the "Ballad of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Burdens," "A Song in Time of Revolution," or to mediæval studies as in a "Christmas Carol," the "Masque of Queen Bersabe" and "St. Dorothy." Already the poet acknowledged his debt to Victor Hugo and his allegiance to Walter Savage Landor, whose indirect influence could be felt in "At Eleusis." But despite his youth, the new poet cut a wide swathe and harvested from Finnish and Breton fields, no less than from Greek and French and Italian. In each case, however, he added what was distinctive, what was unmistakably his own, a new personality; not only new rhythms and rhyme schemes and a diction exceedingly vivid and personal, but a new point of view.

It was early then to see whither away the young poet was bound or where the muse was leading him with his strange, new vision, his passionate dreams and the singing verses he compares to blown leaves:

"The night shakes them round me in legions,
Dawn drives them before her like dreams.
Time sheds them like snows on strange regions,
Swept shoreward on infinite streams;
Leaves pallid and sombre and ruddy,
Dead fruits of the fugitive years,
Some stained as with wine and made ruddy,
And some as with tears."

There was, perhaps, more true philosophy and more meaning in the volume than could at the moment be pressed out and made clear. If he sang his daughters of dreams and of stories with candor and a wholly Latin lack of reticence and false shame, he did not end his thinking here. He followed up "Faustine," "Fragoletta," "Dolores," "Félise" and "Yolande" and "Juliette" with the "Garden of Proserpine" as inevitably, as loyally, as the King of old time, having given us the Canticles, gave us the Sermon, the Song of Solomon flowing quite naturally into the preacher's "Vanity of vanities, all is vanity!"

"There go the old loves that wither," and the mood that follows hard upon the lusts of the flesh had its own most perfect song:

"From too much love of living,
From hope and fear set free,
We thank with brief thanksgiving
Whatever gods may be,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That no life lives forever,
That dead men rise up never
And even the weariest river
Winds somewhere, safe to sea."

If he told the whole tale of fruitless and sterile passions he set forth, too, in "Hesperia" "the transient state through which a man may be supposed to pass, foiled in love and weary of loving, but not yet in sight of rest." The criticism, the outcome of the whole sad matter, was set forth in verse as exquisite. One point, at least, has been overlooked—namely, that only to the most narrow and superficial mind could he seem to be dealing otherwise than spiritually with one of the more mysterious and thwarting experiences of human life. That his own thought was sincere and serious may be derived from the very boldness and abandon with which he wrote, and from the fact that he was totally unaware that the profound subjects he dealt with could be basely or lightly handled.

"And the thorns are too sharp for a boy, too slight for a man to endure," he wrote later, pointing out that "desire is a respite from love, and the flesh not the heart is her fuel," in the poem that describes the mood that brings "a total pause of passion and of thought, when the spirit without hope of good things or evil hungers and thirsts only after the perfect sleep."

In 1871 appeared the greatest single volume of verse Swinburne ever published, "The Songs before Sunrise," and here we find the complete emergence from the turbulence of youth; and the great "Prologue," which strikes the key-note to the new composition, glances back only to make clear how far back lies the past and how manhood copes with the passions and the tortures of youth:

"Between the bud and the blown flower
Youth talked with joy and grief an hour,
With footless joy and wingless grief
And twin-born faith and disbelief
Who share the seasons to devour.
And long ere these made up their sheaf
Felt the winds round him shake and shower
The rose-red and the blood-red leaf.
Delight whose germ grew never grain
And passion dyed in its own pain.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Then he stood up and trod the dust
Fear and desire, mistrust and trust,
And dreams of bitter sleep and sweet,
And bound for sandals on his feet
Knowledge and patience of what must
And what things may be, in the heat
And cold of years that rot and rust
And alter; and his spirit's meat
Was freedom, and his staff was wrought
Of strength, and his cloak was woven of thought."

In the first volume he showed the futility of passion, the immortal agonies of a man who, knowing life to be an ascetic discipline, "desirous of penitential pain, is damned to joyless pleasure." In the new volume he gave what he had to enlarge, to cheer and to fortify. Almost the first thing we feel is that he offered no easy solaces, no ready comforts. To those who have once absorbed the philosophy of Browning, Mr. Swinburne offers the next step upward. Browning assured us, with every aspect of full conviction, that there should "never be one lost good"; that "evil is null, is naught, is silence implying sound"; that "what was good shall be good, with for evil so much good more"; "on earth the broken arcs, in heaven the perfect round." Since it was impossible to close the eyes to the imperfections of this life, Browning accepted evil as a finite misconception, just our human, limited way of seeing the fragment instead of the whole; and the number of struggling and stumbling beings whom he set on their feet by his wide, courageous outlook, by his staunch promises of a future completion, by his hearty explanation that all the joy of growth and progress depended on a man's reach exceeding his grasp must never be underestimated or forgotten. Mr. Swinburne's offering was a different one. His poetic deliverance was far more spontaneous, more inspired, more perfect than Browning's; and, once the little matter of Browning's elisions mastered, Mr. Swinburne was frequently more difficult to follow owing to the wealth of imagery and the magnificence of verbal felicities in which his thought went clothed. But his philosophy, too, was harder to accept, colder and more austere. He made no promises, he paved no way to heaven, he pointed out no perfect rounds:

"For what has he whose will sees clear
To do with doubt and faith and fear,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Swift hopes and slow despondencies?
His heart is equal with the sea's
And with the sea-wind's; and his ear
Is level to the speech of these:
And his soul communes and takes cheer
With the actual earth's equalities.
Air, light and night, hills, winds, and streams,
And seeks not strength from strengthless dreams."

To accept what is, and "seek not strength from strengthless dreams," to endure and, above all, to love the soul's freedom, and worship courage and great-heartedness—this is what he offers us.

"Thalassius," which we must look on as an autobiographical poem, recounts the steps of a poet's life—child of the sun and the sea, "free born as winds and stars and waves are free," he grew up, gathering "fine honey of song-notes goldener than gold"—he learns:

"How he that loves life overmuch shall die
The dog's death utterly.
And he that much less loves it than he hates
All wrong-doing that is done
Anywhere, always, underneath the sun,
Shall live a mightier life, than time's or fate's."

Love and fear and hope and hate he learns; and then he follows the feet of that "lord of terrible aspect," Love, who when unmasked gives his name:

"O, fool, my name is sorrow,
Thou fool, my name is death."

Out of this, too, he passed

"forth of all those fierce ranks
Back to the gray sea banks,
Against a sea-rock lying, aslant the steep
Fell after many sleepless dreams, on sleep,"

till the same voice that taught him in youth aroused him:

"Child of the sunlight and the sea,
A fosterling and fugitive on earth;
Sleepless of soul as wind or wave or fire
A man-child with an ungrown God's desire;
Because thou hast loved naught mortal more than me,
Thy father and thy mother-hearted sea,
Because thou hast set thine heart to sing, and sold
Life and life's love for song, God's living gold,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Because thou hast given thy fire and flower of youth
To feed men's hearts with visions, truer than truth;
Because thou hast kept in those world-wandering eyes
The light that makes me music of the skies,
Because thou hast heard with world-unwearied ears
The music that puts light into the spheres;
Have, therefore, in thy heart and in thy mouth
The sound of song that mingles north and south,
The sound of all the winds that sing of me
And in thy soul the sense of all the sea."

Here, as ever in his poetry, the sun symbolizes intellectual light and spiritual truth; the sea, as always, freedom, liberty of soul; and the sound of all the winds is the voice of the spirit, that spirit that blows, as of old time, where it listeth and no man knows whence it cometh or whither it goeth. In the "Last Oracle" the poet hails the sun as,

"Thou the word, the light, the life, the breath, the glory,"

words which, from time immemorial, have been dedicated to Deity. This, then, is the poet's only promise: who endures to the end, who makes no compromise with truth, who asks no rewards and fears no punishments, shall come somehow to truth and liberty and shall grow into knowledge of the things of the spirit. This promise leans upon no dreams, but is merely the repetition in poem after poem of the saying,

"Unto each man his handiwork, unto each his crown
A just Fate gives."

There is nothing relaxing in this doctrine. Indeed, to a great number of weak-kneed men, who stay alive only by dint of hoping that they shall reap what they have not sown and shall earn more than they deserve, it is too difficult to accept. But whoso braces himself to bear it in all its austerity shall be fortified thereby.

Moreover, the poet's poignant sense of unbound sea spaces, untrammelled winds and wide, waste places is enlarging and liberating. Even in the first series of "Poems and Ballads," with its predominant scenery of country roadside and orchard closes, we get a touch of the sea without shore that haunted him to the end of his dreams, and which surely stood for the spaceless spaces of the soul.

Twenty years later, in the volume of 1884, with its splendid burthen of sea music, we have the great sea "that ends not till

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the world's end"—the great shoreless sea again typifying liberty, and the singer's soul throughout, symbolized by the sea-mew or the stormy petrel, always seeking, and sometimes with the sense that some dark day shall sever "the sea bird's wing from the sea wave's foam." Here we have, too, his first questionings of the ultimate goal:

> "Friend, who knows if death indeed have life, or life have death, for goal?
> Day nor night can tell us, nor may seas declare nor skies unroll,
> What has been from everlasting, or if aught shall always be,
> Silence answering only strikes response reverberate on the soul,
> From the shore that hath no shore beyond it set in all the sea."

Like Shelley and like Marlowe, his twin brethren, he stood baring his soul before "the immensities and the eternities," and who shall say that in the end the great Presence did not make itself felt to him, not as shrivelling all personality into nothingness, but as gathering it up and holding it where nothing shall be lost. The type of his imagination, cosmic in character, wide-ranging, far-seeking, pursuing the ever-shifting horizons, liberates, and his readers feel the letting down of the narrower bars of life while the soul goes, free of its littleness, on wider quests.

As in later years he came nearer and nearer to that great channel, the type of which had been ever before him in the harsh northeastern sea, and strained his eyes to catch a glimpse of the serried ranks of his own beloved beyond, his thought becomes more and more hopeful. When he sings of his father's death he says:

> "The life, the spirits and the work were one
> That here, ah, who shall say, that here are done.
> Not I—that know not, father, not thy son
> For all the darkness of the night and sea."

And of his mother, "beloved above all utterance known of love," he asserts the victory of love over death. Surer and surer the vision; and in the New-year's eve song of Christina Rossetti, written three days after her death, he *knows* her voice unstilled. Mrs. Lynn-Linton's death brings back the thought of the "oldest singer," and he fancies the father and daughter reunited. The sonnets to Robert Browning are yet more assured:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"He who stands now on death's triumphal steep,
Awakened out of life wherein we sleep
And dream of what he knows and sees, being dead."

Surely the instinct of further life reaches gropingly into this; and, as we turn from one of the most spiritual, certainly one of the most bracing and fortifying of the great Victorian poets, whose guerdon can only be given by many generations of men made nobler by his singing, it is fitting to close with his own incomparable words:

"The night is upon us, and anguish
Of longing that yearns for the dead,
But mourners that faint not, nor languish,
That veil not and bow not the head,
Take comfort to heart if a token
Be given them of comfort to be:
While darkness on earth is unbroken
Light lives on the sea."

LOUISE COLLIER WILLCOX.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LAW OF AERIAL NAVIGATION.

BY LYTTLETON FOX.

THE many interesting problems of a legal or governmental nature, which may arise as a result of the achievement of practical flight, have already provoked some degree of speculative comment. The ways and means of policing the air, including the establishment of rules of the aerial road, the enforcement of speed limitations, the relative rights of heavier-than-air and lighter-than-air machines, regulations as to the character of ballast and the dropping thereof; the purely legal questions as to the international control and jurisdiction of the air, the rights of alien air-ships in time of peace and of neutrals in time of war, the dropping of explosives from air-ships (already the subject of a convention of The Hague Conference), all present problems which will tax alike the lawgivers and the executive. No question is so imminent in this country, however, and hence none so important as the construction which shall be put upon the law of trespass as applied to the air.

As soon as the navigation of the air becomes common, the question as to the legal right of the aeronaut to fly across the land of his neighbors will require immediate decision. Most American aeronauts have assumed that the upper air constitutes a sort of public highway through which any one is at liberty to pass, as is now the case in Germany and Switzerland, where the matter is regulated by special statute. A few aeronauts and some newspapers have undertaken to correct this impression by stating with positiveness the opposite view, that no person has a right to fly over any land but his own without committing a trespass. The reported cases bearing upon the subject are, to be sure, both meagre and somewhat ancient. It would be rash to predict to what extent our courts will feel

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

obliged to accept them as controlling, in view of the changed conditions which now obtain. But as the only existing authorities, they must be taken as constituting the law upon the subject at the present time; and an examination of them leads to the conclusion that the question is not so easily answered.

There are no American statutes upon the subject, and our own common law contributes nothing to it. We are at the outset referred, therefore, to the common law of England, and the Roman law. The possibility of invading the privacy of a man's land by passing through the air above it was considered by neither the Romans nor the English in laying down the law of trespass. The early lawmakers proceeded upon the assumption that man's movements were necessarily confined to the immediate vicinity of the earth's surface, and the law of trespass was framed in accordance with this view. The owner of the land held dominion of it from the centre of the earth up to the sky,—*cuius est solum eius usque ad coelum* was the ancient doctrine, beloved of the old judges, and the invader of this pyramidal empire of earth and air was a trespasser. If this rule is still law, there can be no doubt that crossing a man's land in an aeroplane, no matter at what height, is a trespass, and there is no question left for discussion. It is interesting to note, however, that nearly a hundred years ago some uneasiness was expressed by a Lord Ellenborough, Chief Justice, in regard to the wisdom of applying this rule literally in cases of aerial trespass, and more recent judicial utterances have tended to the same conclusion. Beyond question the old principle is firmly fixed as law both here and in England, so far as an invasion upon the surface or to a reasonable height above or below the surface is concerned. The exact problem as to which the decisions would tend to indicate that there is no such certainty, and the one which principally interests the aeronaut is this: Is it a trespass to sail across a man's land at a height greater than the reasonable scope of his effective possession; that is, at a height which cannot be held to interfere with his free use of his property? If it is not, the air is a highway for all practical purposes.

The earliest case in the books, that of Pickering *vs.* Rudd,* was decided in 1815. Rudd nailed a sign to a tree upon his land in such a way that the end of the sign projected slightly

* 4 Campbell, 219.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

over the garden of his neighbor, Pickering. Pickering sued Rudd for trespass. Lord Ellenborough decided that it was no trespass. His decision, so far as it affects the right to maintain a fixed projection or encroachment over the land of one's neighbor has been repeatedly overruled both in England and this country. Indeed, the law is well established to the contrary. His Lordship's opinion is noteworthy, however, because it clearly anticipated the question which would arise in the case of an aeronaut. In it he instances a previous case in which a bullet was fired from outside a man's land, striking within it, and says that while he ruled that a trespass had been committed in that case, he would be doubtful in a case where the bullet should go clear across without striking. "I do not think," he says, "it is a trespass to interfere with the column of air superincumbent upon the close. . . . Nay, if this board overhanging the plaintiff's garden be a trespass, it would follow that an aeronaut is liable to an action of trespass *quare clausum fregit* at the suit of the occupier of every field over which his balloon passes in the course of his voyage. Whether the action may be maintained cannot depend upon the length of time for which the superincumbent air is invaded." This is only a dictum, to be sure, but it is none the less a forcible expression of the view that the air, above the scope of effective possession, is not subject to the landowner's control. Nor is it weakened by the later rejection of the decision itself as affecting fixed projections.

The next contribution to the law came with the English case of Kenyon *vs.* Hart,* in which the defendant fired a bullet from outside of the complainant's boundary-line and killed a bird within, so that both bird and bullet came down on the complainant's land. Inasmuch as the defendant was tried under a statute against poaching, the wording of which was such as to cloud the main issue of trespass, the decision itself is of little value; but the Court indicates in its opinion (by Lord Blackburne) that if the huntsman had missed, and the bullet had sped across the complainant's land without striking, it would have been inclined to hold, with Lord Ellenborough, that no trespass had been committed.

In 1887 a decision was rendered by Lord Henry Hawkins in a case† which arose out of a complaint of trespass made by the

* 6 B. & S., 249.

† 4 Times L. R., 8.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

owner of lands near the Wimbledon rifle-ranges. It appears that the marksmen were accustomed to fire across the plaintiff's land at the targets beyond, so that the bullets passed over his land, without falling upon it, at a height of about 75 feet. The report says: "As regards the complaint that when the 1,000-yards range was used the bullets traversed the land of the plaintiff, his Lordship did not look upon the ground of complaint as constituting a trespass in the strict technical sense of the term, but he did look upon such firing of bullets as grievances which under the circumstances afforded the plaintiff a legal cause of action." Doubtless the Court referred the plaintiff to his remedy against the daily firing as a continuing nuisance. But the passage of bullets across the land at such a height as not to interfere with its occupancy was distinctly held to be not a trespass.

The projection of the cornice of a building, or the maintaining of a bridge or a telegraph wire over the land of another, and all similar fixed encroachments, have, as already noted, long been held to constitute acts of trespass both in this country and in England. The Courts are vigilant to-day in affording a remedy for such offences against the right of property, and the books are replete with decisions confirming the rule. Casual considerations would suggest that in principle there is nothing to distinguish such cases from those in which a projectile is fired across a man's land, or an aviator skims across it, excepting the duration of time consumed by the invasion, which in itself is not, as Lord Ellenborough suggests, sufficient basis for a sound legal distinction. There is, however, one other and very important difference. In the case of a fixed encroachment the courts have always in mind the danger that if the invasion is continued for more than twenty years it will grow into a right of property. An easement will arise giving the invader a perpetual right to maintain the encroachment, and thereby substantially reducing the estate of the property-owner. This could never be true in the case of any single and temporary invasion by an aeronaut. The effect of this distinction is that it places fixed encroachments, such as those mentioned, no matter at what height above the land they occur, in the class of invasions occurring within the reasonable scope of effective possession of the land, because they interfere with the owner's free use of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his property. If the commission of the trespass may operate in time to deprive the owner of the land of some incident of his ownership, there can be no question of its having interfered with his effective possession.

The writer ventures the conclusion that in all cases where the invasion does not occur within the reasonable scope of effective possession, the courts will incline to regard the foregoing cases as controlling and will hold that no trespass is committed. This does not mean that an aeronaut may pass within a few feet of the surface of another's land or buildings without the commission of a trespass, because any passage so close as to cause annoyance or apprehension would be an interference with such possession. But a passage at such a height as to preclude the idea of substantial injury would be lawful. The cases mentioned do not in this respect appear to have been overruled, but have, on the contrary, been cited with approval in later decisions. Sir Frederick Pollock, in his work on Torts, approves the rule laid down in them as the most reasonable one under all the circumstances. They present a view which would suit the conditions arising from universal navigation of the air without doing violence to the existing common law upon the subject of trespass generally. Moreover, if mankind has really conquered the air, the courts will hesitate to lend discouragement by making every passage over alien land a trespass, so long as the common law can be reasonably and consistently construed to the contrary.

But supposing the courts to hold the contrary, and to declare the aeronaut liable to an action for trespass at the suit of every person over whose land he passes, what will be the result?

It is not conceivable that the aggrieved person would be able to prove any substantial damage, even though his right of action be sound. This in itself would probably be a very substantial deterrent of litigation. There are circumstances under which the courts will enjoin further repetition of continuing trespasses, but it is very doubtful whether aerial trespasses of the character in question would be regarded as ground for injunction. It may well be, therefore, that the mere inability of the law to afford any substantial relief for these trespasses would render the trespassers practically free from legal interference, though in fact violators of the law. But that frequent and universal trespass on a large scale, theoretically banned by the law while

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in effect protected by it, should be permitted to continue seems hardly probable. Where there is a right there is a remedy, particularly if any considerable number of persons are clamoring for the remedy. It is entirely reasonable to suppose that many persons in the community would insist upon preventing these trespasses if a means could be found. Heavy objects dropped from flying-machines will be a grave source of danger. Some people would insist upon their rights through apprehension of this and similar perils, and others in order to exact money for the privilege of passing over their land. If trespass is committed, it will not continue for lack of active and interested persons to invoke the aid of the courts against it.

Should the state, by the exercise of the right of domain, take the air above a certain fixed height and devote it to the purposes of a public highway, this would seem to be a partial solution of the problem of trespass. It would not be a complete solution because as matters stand at present the aeroplanist, in order to make a landing, must arise and descend on a slanting course, and should this continue to be necessary trespasses would be committed while passing between the earth level and the upper air. The project of condemning the air, while in a sense novel, would be perfectly feasible from a legal standpoint. There is apparently no question as to the power to establish such a highway. Moreover, it would possess the rare virtue of involving little or no expense. Granting that the air stratum condemned should be at such a height as not to interfere with the most ambitious building operations, six cents would seem to be full remuneration for the property taken from any individual owner for public purposes. The simple European expedient of declaring the air to be a highway, by statute, without exercise of eminent domain, would hardly seem practicable in this country, as constituting a taking of property without due compensation, unless the courts hold, as suggested, that the air is already a public highway above the height of effective possession.

LYTTLETON FOX.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE POWER OF TOLERANCE.*

BY THE EDITOR.

HISTORY is chiefly a record of battle. From the beginning, strife has reddened its pages,—the strife essential to physical existence, the strife requisite to mental development, the strife which cleared the way for moral growth and the gratifying of spiritual longings.

It is an appalling story, that of humankind. But from whatever view-point we regard creation, whether of directly divine origin or indirectly divine through natural processes, the incessant struggle plainly appears as the product, not of accident, but of design. When God set man over the beasts of the field, by that very act He called upon man to maintain his supremacy, if necessary, by force. When Nature evolved the primitive savage, she did not leave him to bask in the sun, but enforced upon him constant activity of mind and body to withstand the perils of the night. Such was the beginning, such has been the unbroken continuance, and such surely will be the perpetuation of the struggle for life, for the life of oneself necessarily, but also for the life of others, to the end.

It is war, unceasing, everlasting war, but purposeful, predestined, inevitable, noble. Between truth and falsehood, between right and wrong, there is no middle ground. Between the earnest searching for truth and resting contentedly in the acceptance of error there can be no compromise. Strife must continue forever between the mighty opposing forces for good and evil. That in the end victory will be achieved and complete dominance be acquired by the Right we may believe, but even so, in the mean time, clearly only works can justify faith. It behooves us, then, in this changed and changing era, to look well to our weapons. Just as

* The substance of an address delivered before the University of Kansas, on June 9th, 1908.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

scores of battles have been won by the discriminating selection of cavalry or artillery or infantry to perform a specific act, just as thousands of duels have resulted favorably from the discreet choice of pistol or rapier, so the unending warfare on behalf of civilization must progress or be retarded as its conduct is marked by sagacity or stupidity. Consideration of the relative effectiveness of weapons is at times peculiarly imperative; it is so now.

THE POWER OF BIGOTRY.

To deny the power of bigotry would be to deny the facts of history. The superior capacity of concentration possessed by a narrow mind makes for strength. Mere persistence is one of the most potent of agencies. So the zealot has writ his name large and often upon the pages of the wonderful story of the world in which we live. His acts in many instances we of to-day can regard only with abhorrence. No savage chief has enforced decrees more barbarous than were some of the laws and customs of the kings of Israel. In the name of few, if any, religions have more crimes been committed than in that of our own.

But just as primitive man was impelled, not by instinct, but by the external necessities imposed upon him by Nature, to learn to kill that he might not perish from hunger or cold, so bigots almost invariably have been actuated by motives that were praiseworthy. Peter of Aragon undoubtedly felt that he was doing God service when he decreed that suspected heretics should be burned at the stake, and so paved the way for the horrors of the Spanish Inquisition. Calvin believed that he was only giving reality to faith in the minds of the people when he lit the fagots at the feet of Servetus. Luther's sole purpose in hounding the German princes to massacre thousands of starving and helpless peasants was to make permanent his great work of reformation. Knox was only striking at the symbolism which he detested when he incited the mob to destroy churches and monasteries.

These were not considerate men. Their measures were harsh, violent and, practised to-day, would be inexcusable. Fanaticism itself is inherently cruel, but how often has it proven effective when other forces were unavailing against injustice and wrong! The humanists drew back in terror from the cause which they themselves had launched before the thunderbolts of the great reformer, but Luther succeeded where Erasmus had

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

failed, and History opened a new and brighter volume to record the broadening of Civilization and Christianity.

THE NEW ERA.

Such has been the strength, the power of Determination, Narrowness, Relentlessness, even Bigotry. But the resolute spirits thus actuated depended for success, not upon themselves or their methods, but upon their cause, which almost invariably was revolt against infinitely worse intolerance than they themselves did manifest. They were the product of conditions, the creatures of environment, the slaves of necessity. Their spears were forged to beat down the like weapons of the enemy. The work they did constituted a requisite step in the unceasing struggle for life, life no longer in the sense of mere physical existence, but in the higher phase of mental development and moral emancipation. Its effectiveness we cannot question. But its methods we need not and should not emulate, its weapons we need not and should not employ, if others more potent in another and better era can be devised. Is not that the precise situation, the most vital question which confronts us of this new land in this new day of universal education and liberated conscience? And does not a peculiar responsibility devolve upon a Nation whose country was discovered simultaneously with the dawn of the new era, whose very life sprang from the same spirit of revolt against tyranny and superstition and whose eminence among states has already become so great as to almost insure its ultimate primacy among the nations of the earth?

THE CRUX OF LIBERTY.

For many thousand years this land, the most fertile and productive in the world, had lain fallow and unknown to civilized peoples when at last it met the gaze of Columbus. Is it not possible that the time of its discovery was a fixity from the beginning in the curious mechanism of constructive development of the human race? The background surely was complete, perfect. As we have seen, thraldom of mind and conscience had been broken by the zealots whose deeds mark the beginning of modern history. Oppressed beings throughout the world felt the impulse, the passion for liberty. The electricity of freedom was in the air. Sects, communities, even peoples, became restive

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

under conditions at home which were regarded as unchangeable. Eyes turned to this virgin field and gleamed with the light of hope and prospective happiness. And yet, it required the intolerance of England to drive from her borders to Plymouth Rock the men whose dauntless spirit became the heart of the Republic and still, let us hope and believe, exercises sufficient control to shape its destiny. From that psychological moment in the building of civilization, pages of history were written with incredible rapidity. Again and quickly intolerance played well its part and compelled the promulgation of the Declaration of Independence, to be followed by the war of the Revolution and the definite establishment of the rights of men as men and not as vassals. And when the time came to lay the corner-stone of the mighty Nation of to-day, how significant, how prescient was the work of the Fathers! There in Philadelphia were gathered together from all sections of the country Puritans, Cavaliers, Quakers, atheists, — all men of strong conviction and signal determination. But never for an instant in that momentous discussion did there appear the spectre of religious bigotry which from the beginning of the world had disrupted nations, wrecked communities and broken families. A new force had arisen. A new king was born. The adoption of the Constitution signalized the crowning of Tolerance. If to-morrow this Nation should be obliterated, if the earth itself should be destroyed, the greatest glory of any people would be left in these imperishable words:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

TOLERANCE IN FUNDAMENTAL LAW.

There was the crux of human liberty, there shone the noonday sun from whose face the clouds of the Middle Ages had been swept away, there flashed the spirit of freedom from which is now springing government by the people from the land of the Spaniard to the home of Mahomet, but underneath and upholding all was and is the one great overpowering fact that there, for the first time in the history of the world, Tolerance was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

written into the fundamental law of a land guided, guarded and inspired by Christian faith.

To make way for ideals it is necessary to shatter idols. And one by one idols have fallen. Simultaneously with the separation of Church and State disappeared taxation without representation. Followed slavery into mere hateful recollection. Arose a keen sense of protective forbearance towards weaker neighbors. Grows by leaps and bounds the movement against the most flagrant injustice of all, imbedded in discrimination, on account of sex alone, between humans possessing alike brains to think, hearts to feel, and souls to be saved. All through Tolerance. The mighty wrench of civil war has disappeared before common recognition of the fact that the conflict was inevitably essential to the maintenance of free institutions. The seating of a President believed by millions to have been defeated was accomplished quietly by a court of arbitration. In all essentials the people have continued steadfast to the spirit and the letter of the one great principle which, engrafted immediately upon their fundamental law, marked the inauguration of a new power in Christendom—the Power of Tolerance.

What of the results? Contrast existing conditions and what do we find? In France, peace and prosperity threatened by paternalism and socialism. In Russia, millions of peasants hungering for liberty still sweating and starving under reactionism. In Spain, where to this day none but the church of the State may erect an edifice of ecclesiastical design, poverty, dejection, threatening anarchy. In Turkey at last a ray of light which soon, alas! may fade. In Germany and England, at painful variance with the trend of civilization, a plain reversion to barbarism, through ostentatious preparations for war and carnage. In America, unprecedented material welfare, constant moral and spiritual upbuilding and, as an inevitable consequence, an ever-widening, ever-deepening influence. The foremost of recent historians died in the belief that ere long the United States would "stretch from pole to pole," and ultimately realize the poet's vision of "a parliament of man and the federation of the world."

THE HIGHER PATRIOTISM.

Whether or not we ourselves share that opinion, are we not in duty bound to recognize the possibility? And if so, how much

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wider immediately becomes our horizon, how much more vital our acts, how much greater our responsibility! Patriotism assumes a new form. It ceases to be fealty to State or even Nation; it becomes an obligation to Christendom, an incentive to the service of all humanity. Because we hate war it no longer suffices to exercise the forbearance which happily we always have displayed toward others. By precept and example we must inculcate the love of peace throughout the world. That God and Nature intended that we should do so is clearly evidenced by physical conditions. Environment plays a leading if not indeed a controlling part in the development of man. Primarily all countries comprised broadly three distinct regions—a maritime region, an agricultural region and a pastoral region—and the characteristics of the people are determined by the requirements of their location. The resident of the belt along the shore, pursuing the line of least resistance in seeking sustenance, becomes a fisherman, and that occupation being notably precarious, he grows to be hardy, resolute, bold, disdainful of danger. The shepherd of the hills, too, being charged with the protection of his flock, acquires a warring disposition and, breathing an atmosphere of loneliness, grows moody and imaginative. It is the inhabitant of the plains who becomes domestic, tranquil, a lover of peace. Therein is found the chief distinctiveness of our land. The great commercial cities of our seaboards are peopled by millions whose natural attitude is that of defiance and too often of truculence; from the hills the first bugle-note tempts those whose manner of life has made them eager for fray; on the plains men instinctively think before acting, counsel precedes rash undertaking, the cost is reckoned, the family is of first consideration. Once enlisted in response to the call of duty, they are invincible because of the very sobriety out of which their determination has sprung; but they engage in conflict not lightly and never willingly except in defence of principle, life or property. To-day in France it is the peasantry, not Paris, that forbids the building of a huge navy in frenzied competition with Great Britain and Germany. So in our own country, despite the vaunted influence of our cities and the restiveness among the hills, the seat of real power is the vast plain stretching from the Alleghenies to the Rocky Mountains. Here is the productiveness which is the source of wealth and prosperity; here is the independence of individ-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ualism transplanted from New England; here is or should be the inherent desire for peace controlling our National policy.

THE MISSION OF OUR PEOPLE.

Can any one, least of all any one born and bred amid such surroundings, doubt that this instinct, as a guide, is safe, that the authority thus conferred by Nature may be exercised to the great gain of civilization? Because history is chiefly a record of battle, must it forever be? Physical warfare is not the strife decreed by the Creator. The strength of a country is not measured by armies and navies. Intelligence, character, conscience constitute the true bulwarks of national welfare. The schoolhouse at the corners is more potent ultimately than a "Dreadnought" of the seas. The little church on the hill is worth a score of regiments. Success in agriculture, commerce and manufacture presages certain triumph in war if the cause be just. During the scores of years when foreign peoples looked covetously upon our rich inheritance and realized the apparent weakness of possible resistance, none ventured to land upon these shores. Think you one would do so now when we are strong—aye, stronger in ultimate resources than any one or two or three foreign powers? Is it conceivable that in these days of enlightenment a ruler, much less a people, would invite the overwhelming reprisal which would surely ensue from an unwarranted attack upon or temporary victory over any portion of territory shielded by our flag? We need no mighty fleets, no great armies for or against foreign enterprises—only schools and churches, as of old, for the elevation of our citizens and the uplifting of oppressed human beings seeking the shelter of freedom. Such, the Fathers of the Republic and our fathers believed, was the true and holy mission of this new people under the protection of the Pilgrims' God! Let us not now be led astray in worship of idols which demand for their sacrifice the life-blood of nations. Rather let us continue steadfast in the purposes, the ideals, the faith of our ancestors, and not only stand firm for peace, but by practice and example discourage the building by others of great armaments which constitute a constant temptation to war.

THE INSTINCT FOR ASCENDANCY.

But it is not my purpose to deal with specific problems which confront us now or may demand solution in the future. It is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rather to present for consideration certain reflections deduced from a study of the past concerning the relative efficiency of methods which may be utilized. If it be true, as it surely is, that the strength of purposeful narrowness began to fade under the illuminating rays of forbearance with the inauguration of a new era, then clearly the supplanting force is one to be cherished, not only in our relations with other people, but among ourselves. No argument need be made to prove that solidarity is a first requisite of national influence. The indissoluble union finally established by force of arms affords living evidence of America's definite and irrevocable recognition of the statement as a fact.

But it is not a mere political Union that is essential to this solidarity before the world. There must be a Union of purpose, a Union of ideals, a Union of hearts, if the highest and noblest aspirations are to be realized. And this can be effected only through the exercise of the power of Tolerance. How this force can be wielded is indicated by experience as recounted by History. We have already noted the effect of environment in the shaping of primitive man and the building of the various segments of the human race.

To-day, despite the partial elimination of distances through the amazing discoveries and inventions of recent years, it is still an influence of magnitude to be reckoned with and regarded with considerate thought. Because a member of a financial community places commercial stability above other considerations, it does not follow that he is an enemy of his country. Because a resident of the seaboard, unduly apprehensive of foreign invasion, deplores immigration and incites aggressive resistance to it, we have no right to assume that his motives are unworthy. Because, as many of us believe, manufacturers demand excessive protection; or because tillers of the soil, regarding themselves, wrongfully to some minds, as consumers rather than as producers, would abolish custom-houses; because poverty insists that wealth should bear the main cost of maintaining government; because wealth would and, as many of us believe, does, place an unequal and consequently unfair burden of taxation upon poverty, the actuating motives need not necessarily be condemned as wholly base. The true cause often lies, not in lack of patriotic impulse, but in that instinct for ascendancy whose manifestations, however

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

distasteful in concrete instances, make, as a rule, for individual achievement.

THE SPIRIT OF PROVINCIALISM.

Obviously the environment or condition which gives rise to such feeling deserves the consideration of fair minds. And while detecting the beams in the eyes of our neighbor, surely no harm can result from searching for possible motes in our own. Neither, we may rest assured, can be removed by common objurgation or by wilful misinterpretation of purpose. Reason affords the only resource, and Reason is not only dependent for its very exercise upon forbearing consideration, but is in practice necessarily Tolerance itself. And just as we cannot hope to convince an individual by impugning his veracity, but may induce him to acknowledge his error through presentation of evidence, so only through acquaintanceship with and respectful consideration of the needs, no less than the attitude of a community, can the harmony essential to true unity be attained.

Often the statement is made that some section of our country is provincial, and so perhaps it may be. But there is no justification for stating the fact as an accusation. A community is only a small aggregation of individuals affected by the same conditions, subject to like influences, charged with conserving identical interests. And all individuals are and should be provincial in the common sense of the term. Else they willingly bury themselves in the morass of socialism and deny to themselves the glory of personal accomplishment.

This is not the spirit which merits deprecation. Far from it. This *is* the spirit, the true spirit of individualism which has made America great. It is the refusal to grant an equal right of self-thinking and self-striving to others, whether the others be communities or individuals, that is baneful, contrary to the theory of our institutions, destructive of personal liberty, and a bar in the path of progress whose setting would have been fitting in the long night of mediæval bigotry, but has no place in this new day of mutual forbearance.

CONCLUSION.

The conclusions then are these: that, in conformity with a fixed law of the unceasing development of the human race, Tolerance has supplanted its antithesis as an actual force; that the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

beginning of its supremacy was coincident with the discovery of America; that here it received its first National recognition in formal and absolute separation of Church and State; that older countries have been and are being stirred to emulation; that, consequently, a peculiar responsibility devolves upon our people not only to maintain, but to enhance the new and better and higher power among men; and, finally, that we cannot hope to fulfil our mission unless we accord it supremacy among ourselves—among ourselves, not only as individuals, but as communities, as sections, as North, East, South and West, holding fast to faith in the integrity and well-meaning of one another, so long as the last vestige of uprightness and of patriotism shall be manifest.

In marshalling the facts from which to make these deductions, I have drawn largely upon the record of the past, upon that surest and safest of guides, experience. The present I have touched upon lightly because I feel that in recent years we have concentrated our thoughts too sharply upon what is, and have accorded too little consideration to what has been and what may be.

Remains the future. To those of yesterday be their due, to us of to-day is left hardly more than consciousness of passing; it is you of to-morrow who hold our thoughts and bear our hopes. I have spoken only to your minds. By simple reasoning I have tried to make clear a vital truth. Whether more is within my province I cannot say. But no one who loves his country could stand in this presence and look into your eyes and realize that you represent so many, many thousands like yourselves in all parts of our land about to go forth to take up the burdens and responsibilities and meet with the joys and sorrows of life, without longing for the magic wand of appeal with which to reach and touch the nobility of soul contained within every human breast. Tolerance the most potent material agency? Yes, as we have seen. But how much more does it stand for! How much better, higher, finer, is the aspiration to which it tends! Do you know that there is only one quality that distinguishes Christianity from a score of other religions? Other religions require faith of one kind or another; other religions inspire hope; but Christianity puts the seal of its supreme approval upon Charity, greater than either—not the charity of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

giving, but of forbearance, of tolerance, of the brotherhood of man! Here is the foundation, the very corner-stone of all of our ideals. Ignore it and you drown in the sea of confusion. Despise it and you adopt distrust of all things, human and divine. Forsake it and you bury conscience and love and all of the sweetness of life. Refuse to see it and a cloud sweeps across your vision and hides in darkness the sun of inspiration to do for others what you would have them to do for you and those you love. You may not understand, but you *may* believe that:

> "What to thee is shadow, to Him is day,
> And the end He knoweth;
> And not in a blind and aimless way
> The spirit goeth."

The spirit; yes, the spirit of forbearance that goeth to make the world akin by inducing God's children, if not to love, at least to be patient with one another. Such is the now-living power and the never-dying glory of Tolerance.

THE EDITOR.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW BOOKS REVIEWED.

Miss Ellen Glasgow is undoubtedly one of the most capable of our present-day story-tellers, and in her recent novel she has turned back to her happy hunting-grounds, the Virginia of the Reconstruction. Her last two novels, "The Wheel of Life" and "The Ancient Law," proved to those who cared that she was a serious and a philosophical novelist; but the large novel-reading public takes its novels as it would champagne at dinner or an opiate at night, and doubtless the present story* will serve better for light diversion. The picture of Richmond and Richmond society is photographic, and many of the characters are easy for those who know the environment well to identify. The struggle of the hero to raise himself from the obscurest of human fates to prominence in the social and financial worlds is the theme of the tale, and a charming little love idyl stretching from childhood through married life is enwoven in it. "The Descendant" and "The Voice of the People" both deal with the same general theme, but setting and characters show how wide a range of human knowledge Miss Glasgow has.

Sally Mickleborough is the regular Southern type of heroine, pretty, proud, high-spirited, unbroken and unbreakable by Fate. She loves and marries the plain man, and during his reverses she is his mainstay and strength; in his prosperity, however, his preoccupation with business strains the relation between them, and the tale is of married love perfected through much pain. We predict an immediate popularity for Miss Glasgow's latest romance, though no one who knows aught of the real value of books could say that in any way it reached the heights of her "Ancient Law" and "Wheel of Life."

* "The Romance of a Plain Man." By Ellen Glasgow. The Macmillan Company, 1909.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Interest in "The Inner Shrine"* has been much stimulated by the announcement that it is the work of a well-known novelist whose name is not divulged. It has been attributed to Edith Wharton, Mrs. Humphry Ward and to Amélie Rives. That it is a woman's book no concealment can make us doubt, and but for the quality of a measured restraint, self-suppression and absence of the Virginia heroine we should be inclined to believe it to be the work of Amélie Rives. But if it is it means that this writer has gone industriously to school to Mrs. Wharton. The story has in it the excellencies of both writers, the care and the craftsmanlike structure of the one and the emotional fervor of the other. The heroine, half Irish and half French, has in her that strange blend of dreamy recklessness and gallant courage which might easily mark a high-bred Norman and Celt descent. Throughout the story she holds our sympathies by being really nobler than she is to outer seeming. The opening in the fast Parisian set and the transference to the old families in New York show a good knowledge of varying social ideals. It is a good story well told, and the analysis of the opposed racial ideals of honor is very acute.

Nothing in connection with recent American letters has been more delightful than to watch the steady growth and flowering of Miss Alice Brown's genius. Delicate, exquisite, but very shy at first, it has increased in scope and quality till it would be difficult to find another American story-writer to be called her equal. No one, remembering "The Day of His Youth," touched with poetic dream-perception, as it was, could have foreseen so fine a novel as "Rose McLeod." It was a delightful story, but it was so much more than a story; it was a wonderfully varied, moving bit of life caught and reproduced, with the poet's and the painter's glamour added. Florrie, the gay old lady of seventy-two, still busy with her love-affairs and her literary hoaxes and her sense of the sheer fun of living, was an achievement not easily paralleled. "The Story of Thyrza"† is a painting of lower life on a narrower canvas. Thyrza is the daughter of a poor village tailoress—a type of pure goodness, high thinking and plain living difficult to find

* "The Inner Shrine." By ?. Messrs. Harper & Brothers, 1909.
† "The Story of Thyrza." By Alice Brown. Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1909.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

outside of small New England villages. There are two sisters, Laura, commonplace, pretty, kindly, matter-of-fact, and Thyrza, fiery, idealistic, high-hearted, ambitious. She is betrayed through the very innocence and nobility of her nature by the man who afterwards becomes her sister's husband. Though betrayed by her innocence, Thyrza pronounces her own judgment and inflicts her own penalty. For twenty years she follows her mother's trade in a small university town and brings up and educates her son. Hers is a noble and exalted character, and she reaps the blessing in the end of those who have hungered and thirsted after righteousness.

This same theme of a woman's fatal mistake has been handled in late years by three American women, Mrs. Deland, Mrs. Anne Sedgwick and Miss Brown. In the two latter cases the women take their fatal mistakes heavily and willingly expiate them, but there is in Miss Brown's a nobler purpose, a higher spirituality. As for the love-story, there is a story of real love running alongside the story of sin and mistake almost as exquisite as Rose's love-story. The final love scene of the dying Barton Gorse and Thyrza is one of Miss Brown's own inimitable touches.

"Silly, silly," says the dying man. "Everything is silly but being kind." One remembers that when, a generation ago, one of George Eliot's characters said, "Kindness is my religion" it seemed a bold and radical utterance, but to-day it is a truism that the best of religion and the best of life is the kindly service of man.

Marion Crawford is dead, and his work is finished. By all accounts and to all seeming he was the best and most companionable of men, and he was visibly a most industrious writer. In twenty-eight years he wrote over forty novels. In fifty years George Meredith wrote about half that number. Those who remember the vitality and exuberant fancy in "Mr. Isaacs" and "Dr. Claudius" cannot but feel that whatever Mr. Crawford may have gained in character by his unremitting industry he lost in genius and vitality by forcing his gift.

The plot of the "White Sister"* is good, but the characters are shadowy and unreal, and the telling of the tale is bald. We

* "The White Sister." By Marion Crawford. The Macmillan Company, 1909.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

get little or no sense of reality and no by-product of description, philosophy, minute observation. "Look at a tree," Flaubert counselled his pupil, Maupassant, "until you see what everybody else sees, and then look at it till you see what nobody else has seen." Maupassant followed his master's advice; he is a world-genius, and his work is life-communicating. Marion Crawford never had time for the second look; he saw only what every one else saw, and so his gift is meagre and commonplace. He was a good man and a lovable personality, but he has left behind him only a large number of machine-made novels, neat but not durable.

"Araminta"* is a comedy of manners, highly polished and lightly handled—as delightful a book as one would want for a summer's day. Araminta is the incurably amiable second daughter of a country parson, big and bonnie and radiantly beautiful. Nor does it detract from her charm that she is entirely lacking in any intellectual subtleties. Adopted and brought out in the most complex of London society by her old aunt, the Countess Crewkerne, Araminta remains faithful to her interest in cream buns and her sister "Muffin's" mauve dress. She is far too simple to perceive the evils of London society and too sweet to be disturbed by her aunt's temper, although its normal condition is severe. A casual introduction, when by chance the splendid creature is seated beneath the Gainsborough portrait of her grandmamma Dorset, inflames the artistic imagination of Lord Cheriton and *costumiers* and milliners are summoned, and the great masterpiece of nature is decked out by the greatest artists in costuming and the simple Araminta is led forth to conquer. It is a tale of pure refreshment, merriment and fun, for Araminta, called "Goose" by her brothers and sisters because she is "ra-ther a sillay," is too simple and too amiable to be dazzled or spoiled by the proposals of Lords and Dukes and comfortably marries the young portrait-painter from Widdeford, who was the friend of her childhood. The story of "Goose's" sister, "Muffin," so called because she was "ra-ther a ragamuffin," is promised for a later instalment, and it is to be hoped she may rival her sister in charm. But it would be, indeed, a *tour de force* to repeat high comedy in so delightful a vein.

* "Araminta." By J. C. Snaith. New York: Moffat, Yard & Co., 1909.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

John Galsworthy is, of all the novelists now at work, the one of whom one can say most securely that his work will live. His books are not written to amuse the idle, but to appeal to the thinking; and there is not one of his books but will stir them to fuller consciousness and deeper sympathy with the helpless and hopeless, the stragglers on life's march. It is one of the chief interests in comparing English and American fiction to note how much larger, more universal and therefore more permanent are the themes of the English writers. Business, humor, a love-affair, an intrigue, an individual mistake and retrieval; at best a single person's life or point of view are the matter of American novels. Mr. Galsworthy's novels deal with social questions; the relation of the victors to their vanquished, of the endowed and the fortunate to the downtrodden, the "lost dog"; this is his subject, and he has brought to it a rare and acute vision, a great sense of justice, insight and power of expression. How far is it one's business to identify one's self with others, especially the helpless, and how far one's business to keep one's self intact—*integer vitæ?*—this is the question the chief character in "Fraternity,"* Hilary Dollison, asks himself, and it is the most vital and urgent question of thinking men to-day. The solidarity of the race, the dignity of each human soul, the improvement of the present type of humanity that is the undercurrent of all modern endeavor; and Mr. Galsworthy, recognizing it, is in the front rank of modern novelists.

In "Fraternity" we get types as cleverly drawn as in "The Island Pharisees" or "The Country House"—types such as Purcey, the Philistine; Stone, the thinker; Hilary, the dilettante and man of taste; and the little model, Bianca, and Cecilia, who stand, respectively, for the untrained child of nature, the bloom of culture and the product of convention. The novel is a strong and vivid production, and we look to Mr. Galsworthy to become a novelist in the great tradition.

Frank Danby is a woman and she writes about women. It would be very interesting to have a clear statement of her scheme of morals. Sebastian,† who is by no means the chief character

* "Fraternity." By John Galsworthy. New York: S. P. Putnam's Sons, 1909.

† "Sebastian." By Frank Danby. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1909.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the book, is the son of a literary mother and a self-abnegating father. The author deals severely with her chief character, the literary mother, who is so absorbed in her father's memory and her literary labors that she entirely omits loving her husband and petting her son. She is passionately devoted to Sebastian, but, believing in restrained expression of the emotions, she really turns him elsewhere for the closer intimacies of life. If Frank Danby intended her books as an indictment of the literary career she missed her aim, for in the end the literary mother seems to be more innocently employed than any one else in the book; she seems to have held herself firmly to high and fine, if not generous ideals and turns out the most likable character in the book.

René Bazin is well known as a great conservative. The inevitable wheeling of the world on its course and the inevitable changes of a progressive civilization are sources of endless distress to him, and he never tires depicting the unavoidable tragedies of mutability. It is the tragedy of the forsaking of the soil and the breakdown of the artificial barriers of caste which he laments in "This, My Son."* Of the charm of his style (even though it is at times ungrammatically rendered), of his keen and tender observation of natural detail there can be no question; but there are striking limitations of sympathy, and it is but to reprehend and point out flaws that he follows the fortunes of the ambitious young Noellet, who, coming of peasant origin, is eager, intellectual and proud. He lifts himself by means of education out of the home surroundings and starts out as a city journalist, only to be thrown back by thwarting and disappointments into utter failure and degradation. The description of life on the Noellet farm, the family life and the country labors, is charming, and it is not the author's fault if his readers cannot be convinced that Pierre's ambitions were false and his failures a just retribution.

Mr. Hall Caine is always devoutly attached to the obvious, and he carefully points out that the curt, harsh, realistic little story

* "This, My Son." By René Bazin. Translated by Dr. A. S. Rappoport. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he introduces* does not accord with his own scheme of morality where the righteous flourish and the naughty are punished. Indeed, there is life, but no moral to be drawn from the tale, unless it be that the strong man will win good out of evil and the weak man make the right cause seem wrong. With unenlightened pessimism, doubtless drawn from Schopenhauer and an unrelenting objectivity learned from Flaubert, Bojer, the new Norwegian writer, tells his grim little tale of the flourishing landowner who signs his friend's note and then declares it a forgery when the time comes to pay. He builds and flourishes upon his lie, while the weakling goes under. This may not be the melodramatic morality of which Hall Caine is fond, but it is austerely truthful none the less.

More and more the tendency of foreign writers is to set down the hard fact and leave the reader to make all inferences. Maarten Maartens's "Brothers All"† is a volume of short sketches of Dutch peasant life admirably drawn, largely painful, but good reading because they give a sense of truth and reality. The outer trappings, although strange and alien to us, do not disguise the common humanity which flows in all our veins.

"There is a certain hour in life when the god passes; he exalts those who respond to him and breaks those who resist. The poacher, loving, grew divine; Thérèse, saving all who approached her, was saved in turn; Mademoiselle Peyrolles, sacrificing herself, was sustained by a truly maternal joy; M. Taffin, whom charity restrained, found resignation possible. For those who give their lives are saved. Egoism only is deadly; Lethois died of it."

This is the summing up near the end of Estaunié's treatment of the "Secret Life."‡ Taking the chief characters of a tiny village near Toulouse, a priest, a maiden lady who is also the chief landowner of the district, and an old scientist, the author shows each life pursuing some private end, some hidden hope,

* "The Power of a Lie." By Jan Bojer. Translated by Jessie Muir, with an introduction by Hall Caine. New York: Mitchell Kennerly, 1909.

† "Brothers All." By Maarten Maartens. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1909.

‡ "*La Vie Secrète.*" By Edouard Estaunié. Paris: Perrin et Cie.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or ambition, or joy until "the god passes," and each one in turn is called on to give himself and his "*vie secrète*" up to the common life of humanity, to a more general welfare. Each must give his life for another's or shrivel up in his own egoism. This is a charming story full of the soft landscape of Central France, the atmosphere of summer and autumnal fields, and the blind strivings of human hearts living, all unseeing, amid growing tragedies. The plot thickens and changes, the suffering and renunciation remain unalterable; but those who trust to the end in the ultimate goodness which rules the universe are somehow justified.

A new Tartarin de Tarascon, a gay braggart, a daring adventurer, a blossom of Provence, is offered us in Aicard's "*Maurin des Maures.*"* That sunny Southern land turns out these Quixotic characters from time to time; people who adopt a rôle and live so persistently in the ideal of themselves that it usurps the real. Maurin, the King, was as happy living upon fiction as the average man can make himself with the most propitious reality. Gay, gallant, unscrupulous, light-hearted and laughter-loving, living in the security and ease of a genial climate and a friendly people, Maurin, known as King of the Moors, with Parlo-Soulet the monologuist, the stone-breaker, and his daughter Tonia the Corsaire, and the military, make up a merry and adventurous tale of laughter, liberty and license of a people still living close to Nature and her untrammelled ways.

* "*Maurin des Maures.*" By Jean Aicard. Paris: Ernest Flammarion.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD-POLITICS.

LONDON: CONSTANTINOPLE: WASHINGTON.

LONDON, *June, 1909.*

SEVERAL American papers have recently made a point of discountenancing the suggestion that in the event of a conflict between Germany and Great Britain the United States would side actively with the latter Power. I have not myself seen any such suggestion thrown out in any responsible British journal. The idea that lies behind it is certainly not one that British officialdom entertains. Naturally enough, considering the unquestionable gravity of the crisis which is threatened by the growth of the German navy, there has been a certain amount of discussion as to the position and policy of the United States. But no Englishman, so far as I am aware, whose opinion counts for anything, has even hinted at the possibility of an Anglo-American alliance to avert that crisis. This country has lamentably failed in many ways to meet the new menace to its naval supremacy in the spirit one would expect from "an old and haughty nation, proud in arms." It has displayed a degree of hysteria and puerility that almost sets one revising the traditional estimates of British character. Its nerves have been badly shaken; it has allowed itself to fall an unreasoning and ridiculous prey to the most fantastic scares. But it has not yet thrown pride and strength so wholly to the winds as to bid for an Anglo-American alliance; nor has it yet parted so completely with common sense as to imagine that in the event of an Anglo-German war the United States would take a single step beyond a strict neutrality. If any British journals have said anything to create a contrary impression, they can only be journals to which no one in this country pays any heed. If Americans have been misled, as they apparently have,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

into thinking that Great Britain in any way relies upon the assistance of the United States in taking up the German challenge, I can assure them that the delusion is of their own making. Every rational man in the United Kingdom understands perfectly well, first, that Great Britain has got to see this business through alone, and, secondly, that the conditions and interests of America are such as to rule out the possibility of anything approaching an alliance. If Americans in an Anglo-German conflict were to show as much benevolent neutrality as Great Britain showed during the Spanish-American war it would be rather more than most Englishmen expect.

At the same time it is believed over here—whether rightly or wrongly, I will not attempt to determine—that on the general question between Great Britain and Germany American opinion inclines towards Great Britain. A great many pronouncements by American journals have been cabled to this country from which Englishmen infer, first, that Americans recognize that Germany's naval ambitions do not affect Great Britain alone and, secondly, that Americans would not willingly see the transfer of naval supremacy from British to German hands. An article by Captain Mahan in "Collier's Weekly" attracted, in particular, a wide attention. In that article the foremost living authority on the influence and history of sea power warned his countrymen that the expansion of Germany's fleet was "a portentous international fact" to which they could not be indifferent. "It is surely," he said, "incumbent upon us to recognize that there is now visible in the near future a foreign fleet decisively superior to our own in the class of vessel accepted at present by preponderant naval opinion as the determinative factor in naval war." He pointed out that while Germany had never contravened the Monroe Doctrine Americans were bound to look facts straight in the face and to understand that "in case of future offence given by some future Castro—a condition almost sure to arise—such superiority at sea as Germany is now establishing puts it in her power to exact whatever reparation she may please, irrespective of the Monroe Doctrine." "Are we willing," he asked, "to leave a permanent element of national policy dependent upon the uncertain indulgence of a foreign State which is notoriously thirsting for colonization in the supposed interest of racial development?" And he went on to emphasize the fact that "if the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

United States should find herself decisively inferior on the sea," she would be obliged either to yield to Germany's pretensions without resistance or to fight with inadequate means, and that in the latter case not only would she be beaten on the main issue and her commerce strangled by blockade, but she might also be called upon to pay the war bills of both sides. So virile and perspicacious an utterance as this from a publicist and strategist of Captain Mahan's eminence could not but powerfully affect British opinion. Englishmen do not, of course, make the mistake of thinking that all Americans are as alert and far-seeing as Captain Mahan; but they judge that average American opinion realizes (1) that a disaster to Great Britain would react unfavorably on America's commercial, financial and political interests, (2) that Germany's predominance at sea would necessitate the building of a very large American navy to avert possible complications in the West Indies, in South America and in the Pacific, and (3) that the peace of the world is more assured while Great Britain remains the mistress of the seas than it would be if Germany were to take her place. For these reasons Englishmen conclude that, if it came to a struggle, American sympathies would be with Great Britain rather than with Germany. But they do not expect those sympathies to take any outward or practical form. They are well aware that America's traditional policy in such matters is one of neutrality and non-intervention, and they see clearly enough that there are a hundred reasons of internal policies why even in the contingency of an Anglo-German war it should not be departed from.

As to the question of an Anglo-American alliance all Englishmen who know America—and they are a large and increasing number—regard it as altogether outside the range of practical politics. If they are asked whether a Power so mighty as the United States and with such wide-spread interests can continue indefinitely to hold aloof from the rivalries and antagonisms of *Weltpolitik* they will usually answer, "No." In some unspecified and incognizable future Englishmen count upon the United States dropping the rôle of a hermit nation and playing a far more active and conspicuous part in international politics; and when that time comes they are confident that Americans will find it to their interest to work in co-operation with Great Britain. But that is as far as they go. They quite comprehend that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

many prejudices will have to be overcome and many traditions discarded before Americans are likely to reach the point of translating Anglo-American friendship into terms of politics. They are perfectly content to wait. They have no desire to hurry matters in the least. In British eyes Americans are undergoing an unconscious education in the realities of *Weltpolitik*. The process will necessarily be a slow one, but there is no desire among responsible Englishmen to forestall what they regard as its assured and inevitable results, and in the mean time they are satisfied if in any question that concerns Great Britain they possess the good-will and sympathy of Americans. That I believe to represent with accuracy and completeness the official and popular attitude towards the relations between the two countries. All Englishmen, I need scarcely add, rejoice that the Anglo-American slate has now been wiped clean of nearly all contentious issues. They dismiss the very idea of a serious quarrel with the United States as inherently incredible. They realize perfectly well that Canada remains in the British Empire by American sufferance, and that even if they wished, which they emphatically do not, to be at odds with the United States they simply could not afford to be so. The British Admiralty has shown by its abandonment of old naval stations and garrisons in the West Indies and Canada and by concentrating nine-tenths of British sea power in the North Sea, the Channel and the Mediterranean, that it has ceased to reckon with the United States as a possible antagonist; and in the debates in the House of Commons a few days ago it was virtually admitted that America was habitually and as a matter of course left out of British calculations in framing the navy estimates and considering the scope of the two-Power standard. For the rest the English people are wholly content to leave the future of Anglo-American relations to take care of itself.

It was announced on June 4th, equally to the relief and the surprise of the country, that the Duke of Norfolk's Holbein, the "Duchess of Milan," was, after all, to remain in England. The fate of the picture and the rights and wrongs of its purchase and sale have been, apart from politics and the failure of the Australian cricketers, the main theme of discussion in England during the past few weeks. The Duke sold the picture, which was once the property of Henry VIII and has been in the country for nearly four hundred years, to a firm of art-dealers for $310,000.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The dealers offered it to the nation for $360,000 if bought within a month. The Government subscribed $50,000 from the public moneys towards its purchase and the directors of the National Art Collections Fund secured promises for $75,000 more; but at the end of the month the sum required was still far from being raised and everybody expected that the picture would be lost. Naturally but irrationally the public were irritated, first, with the Duke for parting with so famous a masterpiece and, secondly, with the dealers for demanding a profit of $50,000 on their outlay; nor were they reconciled by the announcement that the dealers themselves were subscribing largely to the national fund for its purchase. A few days' grace was allowed after the expiration of the month, and at the very last moment an anonymous donor came forward with a check for $200,000. The picture, therefore, is saved and will continue to hang in the National Gallery, to which the Duke lent it many years ago. But the problem of the drain of works of art from England remains. Italy, Greece and Spain forbid the exportation of their treasures, and England, which still boasts many of the finest private collections in the world, becomes more and more the happy hunting-ground of the wealthy connoisseur. The English nobility have pretty well ceased to collect; they are now mainly sellers of what their fathers collected before them. Throughout the whole of the eighteenth century every wealthy Englishman with any pretensions to taste surrounded himself with beautiful objects of art. From time to time they changed owners, but they rarely left the country; the firmness with which the English kept what they had acquired was the despair of the Continental collectors up to thirty years ago. Then, for reasons it would be difficult to trace back to their source, a change set in. The English nobles began to sell freely; the collecting millionaire from the United States appeared on the scene; the old masters fetched incredible prices; and though the National Gallery has secured, on the whole, its full share of whatever was to be had, many priceless treasures have been snapped up by the Berlin Museum and private American patrons. That the drain will continue unless vigorous efforts are made to stop it is certain. A contributor to the "Times" suggests calling in the aid of legislation. He proposes a Government commission of experts to inquire into and to register all the important works of art in the country; a classification of these

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

according to their artistic and historical importance; and, finally, legislation absolutely prohibiting the export of some, taxing the export of others and giving to the State the right of pre-emption in the case of all. It is a bold scheme, but I think a very strong body of opinion might be formed in support of it. What at least is unquestionable is that so long as the National Gallery lacks anything in the nature of an Intelligence Department, so long as the custody of British art is intrusted not to experts, but to well-meaning amateurs, and so long as the Government declines to set aside a large annual sum for purchasing pictures before they come into the open market or to supervise or restrict in any way the disposal of private collections, so long will England be gradually denuded of her stock of artistic treasures. That is a prospect which no one contemplates with equanimity, and it may conceivably prove that the attention aroused by the near loss of Holbein's "Duchess of Milan" will be the starting-point of something like a national movement to keep the remaining masterpieces in the country. It has also been proposed that works of art of great value or historical interest should no longer be included in the death duties, but should be taxed upon their passing out of their owners' hands by sale.

Very great interest has been stirred up in England and Ireland by the publication of a letter written by Mr. Roosevelt a day or two before he left office. The letter was addressed to Mr. Bryce, and in it the President paid a high compliment to Sir Horace Plunkett's work among the Irish farmers and named him as the true and only begetter of the Country Life Commission. The President wrote the letter obviously under the belief that it would be published widely and at once. Mr. Bryce, of course, was debarred from giving it to the world; he could only forward it to the British Foreign Secretary. The Foreign Secretary, seeing that it dealt with Irish affairs, would probably turn it over to the Irish Secretary. But the present Irish Secretary is Mr. Birrell, and Mr. Birrell has no affection for Sir Horace Plunkett and no great belief in his work. One of his first official acts was to turn Sir Horace out of the Vice-Presidency of the Irish Department of Agriculture in obedience to Nationalist clamor. Mr. Birrell, therefore, might easily have worked round to the conclusion that the best way of dealing with Mr. Roosevelt's inconvenient testimonial was to ignore it. Nothing, at any rate,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was heard of it; Sir Horace Plunkett was not informed of the striking tribute paid to him by the President; and it was not until a Western American agricultural paper got hold of a copy of the letter and published it that its contents were known on this side of the Atlantic. There may be some adequate explanation to account for the official suppression of the document, but I am bound to say that the explanation generally suggested is simply that Mr. Birrell considered it better "politics" to disregard President Roosevelt's wishes and rob Sir Horace Plunkett of the credit awarded him.

For the next few months, probably, indeed till the end of September, the House of Commons will be occupied almost exclusively with the Budget. I dealt fully with its general provisions in my last communication and need not now go over the same ground. But besides the Budget time will also somehow—nobody, I imagine, quite knows how—have to be found for Mr. Birrell's Irish Land Bill and for three other measures that bear witness to this Government's insatiable appetite for social and industrial reform. Two of these measures stand in Mr. Winston Churchill's name, and deal, one of them with the creation of a national system of labor exchanges, and the other with a compulsory scheme of insurance in certain trades against unemployment. The third measure is Mr. John Burns's Housing and Town Planning Bill—a Bill dealing with the cognate but distinct subjects of providing better houses for the working-classes and of facilitating the growth of towns along lines of health and beauty. To these three measures, so typical of present-day politics in England, I shall hope to recur later on.

CONSTANTINOPLE, *June, 1909.*

YOUNG Turkey's revolutionary honeymoon is over. The dream-like idyl with which it opened a twelvemonth ago has been rudely broken by the sudden inrush of life's every-day cares. Worse than this, the young nation has had to face a very sea of troubles and do battle for its life. And the struggle is still going on with varying event. Some keen-sighted observers hold that when it is definitely ended the face of the Ottoman Empire and the colors of the political map of Europe will have undergone a momentous change. They add that those who would fain christen

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that change before it is yet born may find a clue to the future in the political currents of the present. In the stability of the new order of things hardly anybody now believes. Hence every Government has its gaze fixed upon Turkey. Eagerness to foresee the coming change, to make it subserve their interests, and to further their political strivings, constitutes the essence of the present foreign policy of all the great Powers.

But the danger that threatens Young Turkey should not be gauged only by the severe trials by which the nation is beset. A better standard will include the sum of forces with which the community can meet them. And the application of this criterion discloses a set of flaws and hitches in the political, social and intellectual equipment of the nation which circumstance may at any moment render fatal. The beneficent and bloodless revolution that amazed and delighted all liberal-minded men a twelvemonth ago was but a soul-soothing vision—viewed through the emotional haze which then prevailed—a prosaic fact transfigured and glorified by a sympathetic world. People ascribed the bloodlessness of the upheaval to the humanity of the mild-mannered, peace-loving exiles who in Paris or London had for years been preaching the Gospel of parliamentarism and the drawing near of the kingdom of brotherhood and peace. Accordingly, men marvelled at the new departure in revolution. For the eye of the distant foreigner beheld in it a latter-day miracle in which ends were attained without adequate means. But to the keener vision of the close observer it was the handiwork of the army, nay, of a mere section of the army, which was quite ready to employ its rifles and heavy guns had not the Sultan opportunely hauled down his flag and offered up the sacrifice of his power. It was Abdul Hamid's timely submission, therefore, that stayed the hand of the army in July, 1908. And what was taken for clemency and forgiveness, on the part of the Young Turks, was but the prompting of prudence, rooted indeed in their feeling for the moral law, but only in so far as that law is reflected in the stern sanction of foreign public opinion. In other words, it was a frank acceptance of the logic of external facts.

Students, aware of this because they had dropped their plummets deeper than the average man, had also a presentiment that a period of storm and stress was at hand. They sniffed thunder in the air. And those among them who went so far as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to predict mass massacres and local risings have to-day the grim satisfaction of seeing their predictions come true. In this, however, there is nothing surprising; a band of political theorists unfolding exploded tenets cannot sway for long the concrete impulses, habits of thought and feeling and the religion of the masses. For it is the bulk of the nation,—rude, genuine, in touch with life's realities,—who alone hold a strong grasp of the roots of national existence. It is their horny hands that must ultimately give its trend to the revolutionary movement and rough-hew the destinies of the political organism. And the bulk of the Turkish nation is saturated with hatred of the principal innovations introduced by the reformers.

In July, 1908, the Young Turks would have made a clean sweep of the *régime* and all its works and exponents, including the Sultan himself. But enforced respect for the public opinion of Europe imposed self-restraint. Subsequently when the danger of troubles from outside had paled the reformers began to rue their moderation. For Abdul Hamid, the hodjas, and the reactionaries were still in evidence, while their "dangerous intrigues" were hidden from view. And the effect of their presence was deemed to be that of a system of fortresses in an enemy's country; there was no going forward until they had been captured and made harmless. The Young Turks accordingly bided their time, kept their eyes open and gave their adversaries rope enough to hang themselves. And their adversaries were believed to be using it. Hence in Constantinople people with a cultivated sense for political conditions claimed to know that a handle for "wholesome measures of repression" would be speedily forthcoming. Last November it was bruited abroad that Kiamil Pasha's Son, Said, whom I often met just then, was suspected of intriguing with Abdul Hamid, that he was being closely watched and would soon be caught red-handed. And report added that Said was only one of many.

But what actually came to pass differed widely from what had been anticipated. The disorders took their rise among the Young Turks themselves. It was a section of the reformers that rose up in arms against the reformed *régime* in the name of religion and with the help of the army.

After the July revolution the Young Turks, like all parties that pass from pulling down to building up, split into groups.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Of these groups one, headed by the Speaker of the Parliament and the officers of the second Army Corps, set the salvation of the Empire in political centralization and the hegemony of the Turkish race. One of its chief aims was gradually to weld together the various ethnic elements of the Empire—Albanian, Greek, Armenian, Bulgar, Arab—at first by cajoling them and afterwards by prevailing upon them to give up their privileges and merge themselves into an Ottoman Empire, one and indivisible. And in that community the Turk, in virtue of great foregone achievement, would play the part of master of events to a greater extent than does the Prussian in the German Empire of to-day.

Opposed to these was the group of home-rulers, headed by Prince Sabah Eddin, whose ideal is a federal State organized on Swiss rather than on American lines, willing to bestow a large measure of self-government upon the various nationalities, to respect their privileges, safeguard their special legislation and sanction their languages, religions, schools and culture. Under this system the mass of Moslems in whom fierce fanaticism, like cruelty in a "tamed" tiger lies dormant, would perhaps have had a better chance of working out its own salvation in the way hallowed by use and wont than on the Procrustean bed of centralization, even though decked out with the embroidery of liberty, equality and brotherhood.

The April rising was started by this home-rule group of Young Turks, who deftly played upon the religious chord that evokes a quick response in the soul of every true Mussulman. The cry they raised was for a return to the religious law of the Sheriat,* and it was the soldiers who uttered it. Religious fanaticism, with which the soul of every Moslem warrior is instinct, was fired. Dimly these simple people felt what keen-sighted politicians had long ago discerned, that Islam and parliamentarism are mutually exclusive, and they were ready to die, as they had lived, for Islam. Accordingly many of them gave up their lives for it. Their premise was right enough. It is no exaggeration to assert that the promulgation of the Constitution was the death-knell of Mohammed's creed. For as Moslems are in their own eyes a chosen and privileged people, it would be impious to draw them

* The law founded on the Koran, ancient tradition and the authoritative interpretation of both, which in the Ottoman Empire is that of Abu Hanifa and his school of jurisprudence.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

down to the level of the *giaours*. Yet this is what the Constitution is doing. To unbelieving officers this equality mattered little. But to believing soldiers it was the inexpiable sin. In Stambul the men accordingly protested in their own rude fashion, slaying nearly two hundred of their unbelieving chiefs, and acclaiming Abdul Hamid the protector of Islam.

It has been alleged that the outburst was reactionary. And the contention is correct. Henceforward every attempt to live and worship Allah in the spirit of the Koran will be branded as reactionary. Mohammedanism itself is reactionary, and in its eyes every hodja now executed by the Cabinet is a martyr.

This was the opportunity of the revolutionary army. It was likewise the opportunity of the Turkish dictator, under whose leadership the army marched upon Stambul to set things right. Mahmud Shefket Pasha won his military reputation and his vast political power during the eight historical days that elapsed between the military mutiny in the capital and the arrival of the parliamentary troops that quelled it. His plan of campaign is described by strategists of marked quality as a masterpiece, his march on Constantinople revealed uncommon gifts of organization and foresight, of caution and boldness, a fiery energy and a delicate sensitiveness to the moods of men, and a grasp of the significance of events which are the outflow of an inborn source.

The victory of the parliamentary army over the Sultan's disorganized followers was gained at a moment when all danger of foreign entanglements had seemingly disappeared. The victors, therefore, could humor their revolutionary passion to the top of their bent and show themselves as they really are. Character, immutable in individuals, cannot be speedily modified in nations. Hence the Turkish people to-day is what it was five years ago. The masses are fanatical, ready on any pretext or none to hew the "dogs of Christians" to pieces. The ruling classes deal with their political adversaries in the same spirit: they slay the more important among them and imprison or banish the rest. This they do, however,—and herein they differ from the Old Turks,—in the name of the Constitution.

Voltaire wrote that in his day when Mohammedans killed a sheep they invariably said, "I slay thee in the name of Allah." Those words hallowed the act. The Young Turks do their slaying not of animals, but of men, in the name of the Constitution,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which they affect to think is near and dear to the heart of Mohammed. "I have taken over the reins of power," Hilmi Pasha piously declared in Parliament, "solely because I rely on the help of the Prophet."* And at that moment he had an irade awaiting the Sultan's signature for the hanging of the ex-Sultan's first eunuch, Djever Aga, of the Secretary of State, Tayar, of Colonel Halil, of the newspaper editor, Lutfi, of the Custom House officer, Teufik, of the editor, Feizil, and another irade depriving of liberty, property and civil rights the ex-Minister of War, Riza Pasha, the Grand Master of the Artillery, Zekki Pasha, the ex-Minister of the Marine, Hassan Rahmi, the Ex-Home Secretary, Mamduh, and Secretary of State Tachson.

Yet these men, who cannot curb their own passion for vengeance, sit in judgment on the common people and ruthlessly send them to death for being just as Allah and heredity have made them. Tens of thousands of political adversaries were thus punished in the latter end of April and the first half of May by the Young Turks zealous for constitutionalism. To-day 27,000 more—civil officials and military officers—have been put on the black list. The Albanians offer another curious illustration. Fidelity to their religion, loyalty to the Turkish race and devotion to the Caliph inspired them to stand by Abdul Hamid and the Koran. But Young Turkey, having returned from its Hedjira, ordered Chafer Pasha to chastise them. And he is acquitting himself of the task right thoroughly. Fire and sword are his favorite weapons. He takes a delight in trampling on everything they hold sacred, in humbling them to the dust. In one of his orders he tells them that they are to deliver up their weapons within twenty-four hours, to abandon the costumes which have distinguished their people for thousands of years and to cut off their pigtails. He has further ordered the Albanian leaders to make windows in the thick walls of their houses which hitherto served them as strongholds. Refusal or even delay will entail the demolition of the dwellings. The Young Turkish Government, a telegram informs us, are resolved to quiet the Albanians at all costs, "even though it should be necessary to flood the land with blood, so that the Albanian wound may not eat away the constitutional organism."

By dint of such drastic remedies they are trying to purge the

* 24th May.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

country of conservatives. Thousands have already been shot, hanged, imprisoned, sent to penal servitude, for fidelity to the Koran and Abdul Hamid. Gallows with three legs—a Young Turkish specialty—were erected before the Parliament, before the Ministries, in front of the bridges, in frequented parts of the capital, and the dance of death began. Swift trials, no appeal and speedy deaths decimated the dissentients. Neither rank nor services availed aught. Even Prince Sabah Eddin was arrested and might, it is said, have been hanged or shot if a wholesome fear of public opinion abroad had not acted as a deterrent. And, like priest like people, the massacres of Adana, the murders at Marash, the sickening scenes of torture and butchery at Mersina, the gutting of shops and slaying of people at Hajin, all point to characteristic traits which will continue to distinguish the Moslem masses for decades to come. At Adana the regular troops fed the flames of burning houses with kerosene, and two Armenian missionaries who were working hard to put out the fires were killed for their pains. The troops despatched to Mersina on the 24th of April for the express purpose of restoring order, landed under the protection of foreign guns and then augmented the crimes and for three days went on murdering the inhabitants unchecked.

Are those people fit materials for a constitutional community?

To sum up, equality of races and Turkish hegemony, equality of religions and the maintenance of Islam, are sets of mutually exclusive principles. And between the two the Government must now choose. It cannot combine fire and water. For the millions of Moslems in Asiatic Turkey there is still but one God, whose prophet is Mohammed, and Moslems who drink wine, eat ham and allow their wives to go unveiled are renegades unworthy to live. For these true believers Abdul Hamid with all his faults was a great Sultan who ruled his people with the fear of Allah and the love of Islam in his heart, whereas his successor is a grown-up helpless baby. In a word, Turkey has no Padishah and Islam is without a Caliph. Now a constitutional Sultan in Constantinople is as a constitutional Pope in Rome, and to subject the Vicar of Allah to the sway of a secret revolutionary society whose power is not tempered by responsibility is as though the rôle of the Vatican were reduced to the promulgation of decrees framed by the Grand Orient Lodge of French Freemasons.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The work of July, 1908, seems to have achieved less a political revolution than politico-social confusion. For the Ottoman Empire to-day resembles a Turkish rosary, the string of which has been consumed by fire. The shiny, black beads are still all there, but they cannot be put together again without another string, and none other is to be had. The burned cord, which can never now be restored, had two strains, religion and the army, and the two were one. Religion was the source of the courage, daring, fortitude which rendered the Turkish soldier successful at his best and heroic at his worst. Religion consecrated once for all the triumph of the Turkish race and dynasty; bound every subject of the Emperor to honor, obey and, if needs were, to die for the Sultan and for the maintenance of Turkish rule. It imposed clearly defined duties upon all, promulgated a law which, coming straight from God, commanded implicit obedience and underwent no change. It enacted pains and penalties against law-breakers and supplied the people with a rough framework of a political administration and military organization which has stood the test of centuries.

In undermining the groundwork of this remarkable structure the Young Turks have been eminently successful. People are still waiting with a feeling deeper than mere idle curiosity for a glimpse of some token that they will be equally successful in raising some stable fabric in its stead.

WASHINGTON, *June, 1909.*

NEARLY three months have elapsed since President Taft convoked Congress in extraordinary session for the specific purpose of revising the Dingley Tariff, yet it now looks doubtful whether a bill to that effect will be sent to the Executive much before the Fourth of July. Following a custom, which of late years has grown up, that of leaving the hard work to be done in the Senate, the revision bill introduced by Mr. Payne was carried with relative promptitude through the House of Representatives. Undoubtedly it made many reductions in existing rates, yet in the aggregate it imposed a somewhat larger tax upon the people than the Dingley act. Then it went to the Senate, which under the leadership of Mr. Aldrich has since been engaged in augmenting the rates materially in many of the schedules. The "conserva-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tives," as Mr. Aldrich's followers may be called, on the ground that they wish to conserve all the protection that Dingley gave and to add to it, believe in revising the tariff upward on the strange plea that what seemed sufficient protection in 1897 is inadequate in 1909. That is to say, an infant industry, if nursed twelve years, loses strength instead of gaining it. The "progressive" Republicans, on the other hand, hold that even if their platform made no explicit pronouncement on the subject, their party was irrevocably committed during last year's campaign by the utterances of their candidate for the Presidency in favor of revision downward. As on most divisions, however, the Progressives have only mustered about a dozen votes, they have been unable to offer much serious obstruction to Senator Aldrich, especially as the Democrats themselves are by no means united in favor of reduced duties on all commodities.

Although, however, the progressive Republicans are not numerous enough to upset Mr. Aldrich's plans, they undoubtedly represent a preponderant sentiment in the Middle West, and unless placated they might be able to weaken the party materially in that quarter at the next Congressional election if not also in 1912. The necessity of averting such an event was the subject of a conference on June 8th between Senator Aldrich and the President. Mr. Aldrich explained to Mr. Taft, it is understood, that the time had arrived for the Republicans in Congress to get together for a final disposition of the tariff controversy. It is not surprising that the Senator from Rhode Island should have found the President in entire sympathy with the desire that the tariff measure now to be enacted should be supported in all its parts by a solid alignment of Republicans and not include provisions for which the Democrats could claim equal credit with a Republican minority. The object which the President as well as Senator Aldrich is presumed to have in view is to place the Republican party in a position to say to the country: "This is a Republican tariff law passed by Republican votes. It was approved by Republican Senators and Representatives from the Middle West as well as from New England. It preserves the Republican principle of protection while reducing many duties, and at the same time it compels wealthy producers to pay a share of the cost of maintaining the Government."

It is admitted that for some time to come the Payne-Aldrich

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bill, after it emerges from the hands of the Conference Committee, will not by means of the customs duties which it levies raise sufficient revenue to meet the annual expenses of the Government, and it is proposed to lay a special burden upon rich men either by an income tax or in some other way. Senator Cummins for the progressive Republicans and Senator Bailey for the Democrats have agreed upon a tax of two per cent. on incomes of $5,000 or over. Both of these Senators are confident that such an income tax will be adopted on June 18th, when a vote is to take place. Senator Aldrich and the conservative Republicans hope that before that day arrives some of the "progressives" can be persuaded to accept an alternative to an income tax. Among the substitutes suggested is a tax of two per cent. on the net earnings of interstate corporations when these exceed $100,000; and there is another proposal which meets with more favor among some progressives, namely, a tax of two per cent. on the dividends of interstate corporations. In the case of the latter impost, however, it would not be levied for more than two years, by the end of which time it is asserted by Mr. Aldrich that the new tariff will yield sufficient to provide for the support of the Government. The constitutionality of such a tax seems to be taken for granted, whereas among the objections to an income tax is the certainty that the collecting of it would be enjoined temporarily, and that a considerable time would pass before the decision of the Supreme Court as to its validity could be looked for. In the interval the Federal Treasury would continue to face a deficit.

Up to June 18th, when the vote on the income tax takes place, every effort will be made, no doubt, by Senator Aldrich and his friends to commend to the progressives the alternative tax on corporation dividends. Thus far, to be sure, the proposal has not been received with enthusiasm in the insurgent ranks, but the fact that Mr. Taft approves of it is likely to have much weight with them. It must be borne in mind that hitherto the progressives or insurgents have posed as the representatives of the President, not that Mr. Taft has authorized them to do so, but because their programme does coincide far more closely than that of Senator Aldrich with the declarations made by Mr. Taft during the last Presidential campaign. It is not true that the Republican candidate for the Presidency never countenanced the imposition of increased duties on some articles. On the contrary, when discussing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the tariff, he was always careful to say that in "some," or "a few," instances it might be desirable to augment the duties levied by the Dingley bill. Undoubtedly, however, he conveyed the impression that in his opinion the tariff as a whole should be revised downward. With what consistency, then, can he sign a bill which embodies the opposite principle? Nothing seems more certain, nevertheless, than that he must sign such a bill or none. The Payne bill, when it left the House, represented on an average, as we have said, a somewhat heavier tariff than that which bears Dingley's name; and the Aldrich bill in its final form, whatever concessions its proponent may consent to make in the conference committee, will be worse than the Payne bill from the point of view of the downward revisionists. Does it follow that the President is sure to veto it? Should he do so, he would incur at the outset of his term the enmity of those conservative Republicans who constitute a large majority of the party in the Senate. That would be a very grave step for a Republican President to take, and especially for a man of Mr. Taft's temperament and character. Suppose, on the other hand, he signs a bill which imposes on the country a much heavier tariff than that which now exists. Can he hope to retain the good-will and confidence of the Middle West? Evidently the "progressives" do not think so. One of their leaders, Senator A. B. Cummins, of Iowa, predicted in the Senate on June 11th that the Republican party would face defeat and destruction unless it met some of the objections made to the woollen schedule then under debate. To retain the proposed duties, he said, would be to subject the Republican organization to "unanimous ridicule, unlimited criticism" and total ruin at the ballot-box. "How do you expect," he asked, "to go before the people and defend these schedules? I marvel at your blindness and your willingness to commit the party to such a blunder!" He added: "I am not urging you to accept amendments drawn up here in a hurry, but how can you refuse to recommit the bill to the Finance Committee with a command to report a bill in keeping with the promises of the party?" Of course Senator Cummins is qualified to speak only for the Middle West. But how can the Republicans elect a President without the help of the Middle West?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE EDITOR'S DIARY.

Vagabondage.

THERE are two old sayings excellent to bear in mind in view of the holiday season; one is:

"Mistrust all enterprises that require new clothes,"

and the other is Stevenson's excellent warning:

"Whichever way the highways tend,
Be sure there's nothing at the end."

Once a year, at least, the complete man must have the courage to put on one side his habitual state and try his resources alone. The restless element of precipitousness in our natures requires us to go adventuring once in a way; with our best clothes and our worldly estate left far in the background, we must go forth afoot or on horseback or in a catboat to see and hear what our spinning world may have to confide to us as it wheels round the sun and among the planets. We live so much of our lives in the complete disguise of our finest raiment, parading up and down the stupid, crowded highways of life, hearing only the futile clamor of empty human utterance. How are we to know ourselves or the earth which brought us forth if we do not from time to time make the complete escape and play alone between sea and sky? A holiday on an hotel porch or a crowded steamer brings no refreshment to the spirit, no new messages from the stars.

It is pleasant to hear in England and Scotland of a new mode of vagabondage. Many who want to be free for a season from finite cares go off in caravans, with a rough housekeeping outfit inside, a folded tent for the night and patient oxen to draw them. Then the hours grow long, and the old-time leisure of the world sets in; strife and ambition fall asleep; machine-made talk and artificial sentiments shrivel and life is sweet because the horizon is wide, the winds free and the sea's voice laden with wonder tales,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the golden flood of the changing hours is glad to watch. Do you remember the greeting of the Romany child when he met his world-weary brother? He said:

"Life is sweet, brother."

"Thou thinkest so?"

"Think so! There's night and day, brother; both sweet things; sun, moon and stars, brother, all sweet things; there's likewise a wind on the heath. Life is very sweet, brother. Who would wish to die? A Romany child would wish to live forever."

"In sickness, Jasper?"

"There's the sun and the stars, brother."

"In blindness, Jasper?"

"There's the wind on the heath, brother, and if I could feel that I would gladly live forever."

If the rich man has his estate and his pride and his fears and his avarice and his industries and his ambitions it is the man who, from time to time, can go forth a-vagabonding who tastes life itself. He best learns what a fruitless breeder is the human heart, heaping selfish desire upon desire, nourishing the cravings which shall eat the heart that gave them birth. But the soul is very lonely and whatever else of the triple human being thrives in the herd it shrivels and must learn to wander alone and know the surging of the "wrath-faced father, Sea," and hear his liberating song of the endless march of the worlds among the stars. If it seems at first too great a song, too triumphant for mortal heart to bear, it has its homely moments too, its sunshine interludes; the wide stretch of horizon beneath which the sea sings and the earth spreads itself heals wounds and binds the gashes of fretful human life; it restores all that the narrowed, artificial life of mere social strife has stolen; it soothes the distempered intellect and opens boundless vistas; it remarries the human heart to earth.

We should recommend as a cure for all nervous invalids two weeks alone and afoot in an unknown country, or a month in a caravan in untried woods, or skirting the coast of an unseen land in a catboat with one silent skipper. How should earth and sea and sky fail to cure the brain made of its dust and froth and air?

Who goes a-vagabonding knows what health is; and he learns that, despite all thwarted hopes and insistent deprivations, life is good, and the sun and the stars and the wind on the heath are the soul's true happiness; they are all sweet things, brother.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED